THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

In 1935 a small unpretentious booklet entitled *Philemon among the Letters of Paul* was published in the United States of America. In those days, however, the interchange of theological books between that country and our own was very much smaller than at the present time. Moreover the author, though bearing a famous name, was at that time unknown here. The result was that the book was hardly heard of in the United Kingdom. Now, however, twenty-four years later, the name of John Knox is well known among students of the New Testament. He has written several important books, and is joint-editor of the new Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. This little book of his on Philemon has been recently revised and re-published by the Abingdon Press,[1] and will be welcomed in this country by those who missed the opportunity to read it in the earlier edition.

It is one of the curiosities of New Testament history that a brief personal note, like the Epistle to Philemon, dealing with what appears to be a private matter, should have been raised to the status of Holy Scripture. Even early writers, like Jerome and Tertullian, express a measure of uneasiness about it. Professor Knox, however, insists that it is its very insignificance which makes it significant. 'The more anomalous the presence of Philemon in the collection appears, the more significant must it be. The more grounds can be cited for its exclusion, the more important must have been the ground upon which it was actually included. The very fact that Philemon seems so out of place is evidence that the original editors had very good reasons for including it.'

Determined to discover the significant secret which lies behind the presence in the Canon of this pleasant but theologically unimportant book, Professor Knox addresses himself to a close study of the Epistle. Some of his conclusions are familiar through the work of English scholars who have quoted them, but many readers will be grateful to have available the full range of the skilful and sustained arguments as well as the conclusions to which they lead.

The first chapter establishes its point beyond any doubt. It is that in the letter the Apostle is not merely sending back a runaway slave and asking his own master to forgive and reinstate him, but he is also tactfully pressing that the slave be sent back to him to be his helper in his imprisonment. 'I would have been glad to keep him', writes Paul, 'in order that he might serve me on your behalf during my imprisonment for the gospel; but I preferred to do nothing without your consent . . .' These words themselves, once their significance has been pointed out, are sufficient proof, but Professor Knox has many other pieces of supporting evidence to bring forward in confirmation. The preservation of the letter suggests that the request was granted, and the fact that Onesimus returned to Paul to be his helper is a major factor in understanding the significance of the letter.

Next comes a careful study of the relationship between Colossians and Philemon. The undoubted conclusion is that they were written at the same time and carried by the same bearer to the same area of Asia Minor. Onesimus is mentioned in Col 4^{9}, as being 'one of you', and Archippus, who is one of those to whom the letter to Philemon is addressed, is named in Col 4^{17}. Much other supporting evidence is brought forward as well. Particular point is made of the emphatic paragraph Col 3^{22}-4^{1}, dealing with the relations of slaves and masters. In this section Col 3^{25} is a problematic sentence. It reads: 'The wrongdoer will be paid back for the wrong he has done, and there is no partiality'. Here it clearly refers to slaves. Commentators, however, have felt its greater appropriateness as addressed to masters; indeed in Ephesians, where the wording of Colossians is being largely reproduced, it is transferred to the paragraph about masters (Eph 6^{9}). Professor Knox insists, however, that it is a most significant and appropriate sentence, as written to a church which will also read of Paul's request about Onesimus, and perhaps wonder if something less than justice is being done, or favouritism being shown.

Professor Knox also addresses himself to the unsolved problem of the other letter, mentioned in Col 4^{16} as 'the one from Laodicea'. Why should it be the letter *from* rather than *to* Laodicea? Other explanations fail to account for

[1] $2·00 net.

this preposition. Knox's suggested solution is this: Laodicea was the important capital city of that area of Asia Minor. In comparison Colossae was a tiny and unimportant place. Philemon, the first of three addressed in the letter known by his name, was not in fact the owner of Onesimus, but rather the Christian leader of the Church in the whole of that area, who lived at Laodicea, the chief city. The owner of the slave was Archippus (named third), and he lived at Colossae and was a member of the Church there. The letter of Paul was, however, addressed not to him only, but also to the leader of the Church in the area, because Paul felt the whole subject at issue was a matter for the Church. The letter would therefore first be delivered to Philemon at Laodicea, and then sent forward to Archippus and the Church in his house, with Philemon's authority and recommendation. And the Church is requested in Col 4^{17} to urge Archippus to obey Paul's request, in the verse which follows immediately after the mention of the 'letter from Laodicea'. This 'letter from Laodicea' is, therefore, the one we know as the letter to Philemon.

The final question which Professor Knox asks—and answers—is: How did this letter, so slight doctrinally, gain a place in the Pauline Corpus of letters from the time of the very formation of that Corpus? It can only be, he suggests, because of some special personal interest in it, felt by the one who first carried out the project of collecting Paul's letters. If it had been treated on its merits, it would hardly have qualified as potential Scripture. What personal motive, then, could have led to its inclusion? At this point Professor Knox introduces a careful study of Ignatius' letter to the Church at Ephesus, written in Asia Minor about A.D. 110, and indicates some most striking parallels in it to the letter to Philemon, which cannot be other than deliberate. Why are these parallels there? It is true that the situation is similar in each case, in that Ignatius is asking that one of the Ephesians be allowed to return to help him. But another similarity is that the Bishop of the Church at Ephesus is called Onesimus. If this were the same man as the letter to Philemon pleaded for, the reason for the unmistakable parallels is clear. Moreover, if the slave was a young man of under twenty when Paul wrote, he could have been a bishop in A.D. 110. If Paul wanted him so much, he must have been a young man of special promise. Moreover, if Paul was in prison at Ephesus, Ephesus might well have continued to be the sphere of Onesimus's Christian work. From this Professor Knox argues that if Onesimus was Bishop of Ephesus in A.D. 110 he might well have been Bishop or a prominent leader in A.D. 90. This date is named as the date when Paul's letters were first collected. The most likely place for this to have happened is claimed as Ephesus. Is it possible, therefore, that the collector of these letters was none other than Onesimus? His devotion to Paul might well make him eager for the task, and his deep personal attachment to the little letter to Philemon, which had meant so much in his own life, would explain its presence in the corpus.

Knox accepts Goodspeed's theory that Ephesians was first written after Paul's letters had been collected, to serve as a kind of introduction to them—and possibly written by the collector. If Onesimus was compiler of Ephesians that would also explain why Ephesians, though using phrases borrowed from all the other Pauline letters, borrows far more extensively and often word for word from Colossians, because Onesimus would have known Colossians longer and more intimately than any of the others.

Knox would not claim for this hypothesis more than that it is an interesting possibility, and certainly it is far from being a proved fact. It is, however, not more fanciful than the theory that Priscilla wrote Hebrews or that Lazarus wrote the Fourth Gospel, and both these claim famous names in support. But whether all its conclusions be accepted or not, this is a most skilfully argued thesis, fascinatingly interesting to read, and most ingeniously conceived. Readers should not dismiss it as too fanciful until they have read the book with the care it deserves.

There are certain men whose names are known even by those who have never read a word of their works, and such a man is John Chrysostom. The name Chrysostom remains as the symbol of oratory and power in preaching. Chrysostom's life story has been ably and vividly retold by Mr. Donald Attwater in *St. John Chrysostom: Pastor and Teacher*.[1]

Chrysostom lived in one of the great ages of history. Three years after his death in 407 Alaric sacked Rome. Just about the time that Chrysostom died the Romans were leaving Britain and the Jutes, the Angles and the Saxons were beginning to arrive. He was a contemporary of St. Martin of Tours, the founder of Western monasticism, and of St. Patrick of Ireland. Chrysostom was born and brought up in Antioch in Syria. Antioch was a brilliant and a pleasure-loving city. 'Nobody ever accused them (the citizens of Antioch) of being serious-minded, and their morals were a byword.'

[1] Harvill Press; 18s. net.

Originally Chrysostom was intended to be a barrister, and he had the finest education which it was possible to give him. He took full advantage of it. At that time the master-orator was Libanius. When Libanius on his death-bed was asked to name his successor, he answered: 'It would have been John had not the Christians stolen him from us'. Already John was Chrysostom, the golden-mouthed.

In the midst of his brilliance there entered into the life of Chrysostom the influence of the gentle and gracious Bishop Miletius. Under his influence Chrysostom forsook secular studies and applied himself to 'watering his soul from the fountain of the Bible'. He was baptized as a Christian in 367. 'From that time,' says Palladius, 'he neither swore oaths nor defamed anyone nor lied nor cursed, and even objected to facetious japes.'

He began his life as a Christian as a hermit in the desert; but it was not long before he was sickened by the extravagances of the hermits, and he returned to Antioch to be a preacher and a pastor. From 386 to 398 he was the famous preacher of Antioch. In 398 he became Archbishop of Constantinople, and there his eloquence resounded until his banishment to Cucusus in the Taurus in 405. Finally, he died in exile in 407.

It will be as a preacher that Chrysostom is for ever remembered. And it is as a preacher that we must look at him. He was essentially a *Biblical preacher*. He regarded the study of the Bible as even more necessary for the Christian whose work was in the world than for the monk in the desert. 'The Christian who does not know the Bible is a workman without tools. It is the spring that waters the soul, to read it with loving attention is to talk familiarly with God.' Chrysostom has been called 'the greatest pulpit expounder of the Bible who ever lived'. As a preacher he had *an intense belief in the Holy Spirit*. 'What matters in an imperial document is the Emperor's signature, not the sort of paper and ink used. And so it is with baptism: the tongue and hands of the priest are only the pen and the paper, the hand which writes is the Holy Spirit Himself.'

As a preacher he knew how to seize *the opportunity of the moment*. 'Please listen to me', he said to his congregation. 'You are not paying attention. I am talking to you about the Holy Scriptures and you are looking at the lamps and the people lighting them. It is very frivolous to be more interested in what the lamplighters are doing than in what the preacher is saying. After all I am lighting a lamp too—the lamp of God's word.' He was insistent on *the witness of the Christian life*. He sternly condemned what Father Bede Jarrett used to call 'the deadly scandal of ordinary life'. 'You may rest assured that if our brethren in the faith are scandalized by our vices, unbelievers will be still more so.' He condemns inordinate sorrow in the time of grief as a denial of the Resurrection, and an invitation to the world not to believe in the Resurrection.

As a preacher he was a passionate advocate of *social justice*. Chrysostom was convinced that man cannot live by bread alone, but he was equally convinced that man cannot live without bread. 'Riches are called possessions that we may possess them, not be possessed by them.' 'All our evils come from those icy words "mine" and "yours".' As a preacher he was a man of *courage*, and no respecter of persons. He was unsparing in his condemnation of the vices of the Court at Constantinople. 'Chrysostom sometimes almost shrieks at his delinquent Empresses', says Father Cyril Martindale. He preached a sermon with reference to the Empress Eudoxia in which he said: 'Again Herodias storms and runs wild, again she dances, again she asks for John's head on a platter'. The Biblical reference and allusion may not in fact be wholly accurate, but the courage of the man is beyond question.

It was little wonder that in the end Chrysostom was banished. Mgr. Duchesne remarked that 'the only way to keep Chrysostom out of trouble would have been to deprive him of the power of speech'. But even in remote Cucusus he still exercised a tremendous influence by a vast correspondence on all kinds of subjects ranging from the appointments of bishops to cures for a cough. His captors finally killed him by compelling him to take a journey to a still more remote region. When he could travel no longer, they took him to a little chapel. 'At his request the clergy there put clean white clothes upon him. He received the Holy Mysteries, and in a few hours St. John Chrysostom was dead. The last words that issued from his golden mouth were: "Glory be to God for all things. Amen".'

Mr. ATTWATER has given us a scholarly and well-documented biography of one of the world's greatest preachers. And this is a book which every preacher of modern times can read with profit. 'He who praises a holy man', wrote Chrysostom in one of his sermons, 'ought to imitate him, and if he be not ready to imitate him, he ought not to praise him.' Chrysostom is a model, not only for preaching, but also for life.

Some Impressions of Theological Education in America To-day

By Professor Hugh Anderson, B.D., Ph.D., Duke University, Durham, North Carolina

American education in general is currently facing a great dilemma. Admirably self-critical, many American educators have been looking at the educational process as a whole and asking whether they have not in the last two or three decades gone too far out on a limb for 'progressive education', with its emphasis on a very broadly-based liberal training in the arts and science, to the neglect of specialized study in narrower fields of enterprise. The Russian victory in the race to conquer space by the launching of Sputnik I has certainly sharpened the dilemma. As a result the Government – not without some panic – has decided to devote considerably more money and energy to the promotion of special research in science and technology. Meantime departments of the humanities in universities and colleges are waiting and wondering what the future will hold for them.

It is against this background of critical examination of existing standards and methods in the total educational structure that the present position of American theological education has to be viewed. If the criterion of a good educational system is that those involved in administering it are constantly investigating its aims and ends, and its efficiency in realizing these, then American theological education is healthy. For I do not imagine there is a divinity school in the country, except perhaps the most conservative, that is not rethinking its strategy in the face of the great challenges presented to the Christian ministry in the present age.

The task of reconstruction is made more complex and arduous by the fact that the American theological school inherits through its students the weaknesses and limitations inherent in their earlier education both at high school and at college. In America neither the school nor the college offers opportunity for the early specialization which is typical of English and to a lesser extent of Scottish education. They stand rather by a broad mixture of arts and science. The A.B. graduate, it seems to me, suffers from not having had to participate in intensive study on a narrow front. The consequence for theological education is that departments of systematic theology in the divinity schools, for example, are placed at a special disadvantage, for they cannot presuppose in their students, even though they have 'majored' in philosophy for the A.B. degree, anything like the close intimacy with the history of Western philosophical thought, of which the Honours Philosophy graduate of a British university was, and still is, we hope, possessed. Again since American culture generally seems to put at best a minimal emphasis on the study of foreign languages, particularly 'dead' languages, very few students come up for the B.D. with a working knowledge of Hebrew or Greek—a serious handicap in the field of Biblical studies. Indeed it is common for those engaged on Ph.D. work in Old or New Testament, to be wrestling still with the Biblical languages in a fairly rudimentary way. More distressing still, it is sometimes found necessary, to the deep sorrow of many theological teachers in America, to prescribe courses in 'remedial English' for a few B.D. students.

Another aspect of the case in America is that the country is so vast in extent that the churches find it very hard to keep in close touch with their preministerial students, many of them attending colleges hundreds of miles away from home, in order to guide them and advise them regarding their undergraduate courses of study. This is done in Britain quite effectively by education for the ministry committees and other similar agencies.

American theological schools then deserve sympathy in that they have to grapple with preliminary problems, which are not of their own making, and to which theological teachers would want to see an early solution. As it is, the divinity schools have numerous problems of their own on the home front. For one thing the average age of marriage among students seems to be much lower than in Britain, so that in most divinity student bodies it is safe to say that more than half are married. While of course it is not axiomatic that taking a wife arrests forthwith the process of study and learning, nevertheless there are tensions created by financial strain, housing difficulties, domestic and family problems, which often prevent a student doing his best work. Secondly, owing to the peculiar historical growth and development of one or two of the major denominations in

America, a situation has arisen in which local churches are staffed by full-time student pastors. The handicaps involved in doing two man-sized jobs at once are obvious.

There is another feature of the life of the divinity school in the United States which suggests itself to me as a result, I must emphasize, of personal impressions and observations. Considerably fewer ministerial students than in Britain appear to have real certitude about their 'calling' to the Holy Ministry. Many even towards the end of their college careers have not 'found' themselves, or rather have not been 'found'. An interesting sidelight on this is the granting lately of Rockefeller awards to men for a year's post-A.B. work in order to decide during that period whether they will take up the ministry as a life-career. Some schools, such as Yale, have sought to meet the need at this point by appointing a Professor of Christian Vocation.

Experiments like this apart, it is not easy to say to what extent the quite widespread uncertainty about 'calling' is the fault of the schools themselves. Is the theology of the schools of higher academic standing 'kerygmatic' enough? Is the intellectual integrity of scholarship matched by commitment to the gospel in its ultimate claim upon us? Is theological teaching also at salient points confrontation with the Word? These are searching questions–we shall come back to them later–which any body of theological educators in any part of the world must ask themselves, but they seem to me to be particularly pertinent to the American scene at the present. For some of us remember with gratitude that we owe to our teachers in divinity not only the illumining of our minds, but the kindling and inspiring of our souls.

The contemporary ferment of discussion concerning the condition of theological education in America centres chiefly in curricular matters. What has happened is that in the last twenty years or so the traditional, basic disciplines of Old and New Testament, systematic theology and Church history in the theological curriculum have been more and more supplemented with separate courses in practical theology, homiletics, Church administration, urban ministry, rural ministry, pastoral care, psychology, religious education, speech, etc. It now transpires that the old foundational disciplines have been put in jeopardy, and that the attempt to come to grips with the problems of practical theology, worthy enough in itself, has tended to lead to a very functional view of ministerial training. Curricula in many places have thus become top-heavy, overloaded with a plethora of 'splinter' courses on 'practical' subjects. The result undoubtedly often is student confusion, frustration and exhaustion—so many are the man-hours required in attendance at classes, each one with its own several assignments. I have heard students say that they themselves would much prefer to do more concentrated and specialized work on less, than less work of a superficial kind on more. I can picture the British theological student, faced with so forbidding an array of classes and given all too little time for the free and independent reflection that is essential to higher learning, 'creeping', as Shakespeare's schoolboy, 'like snail unwillingly to school'.

Another sequel of the accretion of a wide variety of 'practical' courses to the curriculum and the perhaps disproportionate importance given to them, has been an uneasiness and tension within faculties between the theoretical or theological group of teachers and the practical or vocational group, each somewhat unsure about its specific relationship to the other, and each a bit uncertain about its place in the total process of theological education. For my part I would simply say this. The practical theologian has, or should have, as the unifying force behind all his vocational guidance and leadership, a well assimilated and co-ordinated body of theological truth. Many of us on the other hand now realize in retrospect that we derived much of our most valuable 'practical' training from philosophers, theologians, Biblical scholars, and Church historians, who combined to give us a clear, controlling perspective from which to view our whole work in the Holy Ministry as prophet, priest and pastor.

What then of the recent products of theological schools in America? The American pulpit has at the moment its bright particular stars, but mainly rather older men. By and large the preaching of the younger men, if one may presume to offer an opinion, is not of high quality. It may be that under all the pressures of the time many ministers in the major denominations are so engrossed in pastoral counselling, administration and organization that the proclamation of the Word no longer has pride of place with them. Rarely it is that one hears the authentic apostolic note, the heralding with fervent conviction of the positives of the gospel in all its relevance to modern man's predicament. Yet we are faced with the inescapable fact that the churches in America, on the surface at least, are 'booming', while in Britain they languish. Whatever complex factors account for this contrast, there surely is food for thought here, especially for the proud Scot!

Recent Ph.D. graduates who have gone out into college teaching are not likely, it seems, to attain to the scholary eminence of distinguished

seniors and predecessors, unless in the course of their teaching careers they can find scope for unhampered and independent research. For, as things are in America now, the philosophy of the Ph.D. degree in most schools is such that it largely perpetuates the concept of a broadly-based education, and only after two years of attendance on many classes, does the Ph.D. student concentrate in his final year on his dissertation or thesis.

American professors are writing an unbelievable number of theological books these days, and that may betoken a vitality which divinity schools in Britain are lacking. Professor D. W. Brogan, some time ago in an article in *The Glasgow Herald*, asked why important works on the Qumran Scrolls had come from the Sorbonne, Yale and Manchester, while from Scotland not a word. Be that as it may, one of the dark clouds on the American theological horizon is the appearance in much of the writing and contemporary dialogue of the most verbose kind of theological jargon, used by teachers, and copied not unnaturally, although in their case it is quite out of character, by many students. I am not referring here, I may say, to the terminology employed in his Systematic Theology by Paul Tillich, much of which is drawn from modern psychology, but which reveals profundity of thought and is characterized by exactitude of definition. I refer rather to the complex and obscure forms of expression in use in many other quarters. I quote only one sentence as an example from a recent work on the Church by a very reputable American theologian: 'In the church there is forgiveness and reconciliation, and the life of new humanity because the congregatio of repentant sinners is a response to the divine convocatio, because the faulty and divided memory of the community is united in the oneness and perfection of the One who is remembered, because the hesitant love and questionable obedience of this people are directed to the real Lordship of Christ, and because even in the faintness of its hope it is bound to and shaped by what is really coming-to-be'. Would it be a mark of dullness to ask for condensation and simplification here? Yet even this is crystal clear compared with the foggy language perpetrated by some lesser men. One is reminded of the apposite story concerning Dr. James Black. Black was invited to be minister of an important Scottish church when still a young man, and feeling ill-equipped for the task went to consult Dr. Alexander Whyte. And Whyte asked him but one question, as if by it to demonstrate the one essential qualification —'Young man, can you clarify your thought?' Even professional theologians should not be exempt from aiming at lucidity, directness and verbal precision.

I have indicated already that American theological schools are deeply aware of their many problems, are groping after satisfactory solutions, are asking incisive questions about the place and function of the minister in modern life, and are seeking to correlate the curriculum and training they offer with their understanding of the nature of the ministry to-day. Changes and adaptations are taking place everywhere. Meantime a helpful basis of discussion has been provided by the Niebuhr Report on *The Advancement of Theological Education*, published in 1957. This Report was the result of a comprehensive survey of theological education in American and Canadian Protestantism, instituted by the American Association of Theological Schools, and undertaken by H. R. Niebuhr and J. M. Gustafson of Yale, and D. D. Williams of Union Seminary, New York. It furnishes some very useful statistics, and deals with such things as the economics of theological education, problems of administration, etc. But its chief merit lies, I think, in the mature comments of the team on the adequacies and inadequacies of present curricular structures.

They acknowledge the need to retain the 'classical' disciplines of Bible studies, Church History, Theology, Pastoral Theology and Homiletics, but affirm that if the ministerial student is to enter into dialogue with contemporary thought and culture, he must also be introduced to the many disciplines relating to man and his world, such as psychology, sociology, world religions and literary criticism. They recognize however, that the difficulty is precisely that the usual curriculum is already too heavily loaded with courses and that American students have already far too many classes to attend. Their conclusion is that three years is simply not long enough to train a student in all the facets of the many-sided work of the minister in our time. But they reject the idea of a four year period of study because of its financial impracticability, and more so because, if it is merely a prolongation of existing patterns, it may merely be an evasion of the dilemma about what to do with theological education. The report speaks favourably, however, of the value of an 'internship' year of practical training in the parish ministry, but most of all recommends to the schools the establishment of a well-developed and extensive in-service training programme, such as would ensure the most effective integration of field experience and theoretical understanding. In-service training would be provided mainly by Summer Schools in the first few years of the minister's career.

Has all this anything to say to British theological education to-day? I believe first that the Niebuhr Report presents a real challenge to British theological schools to take stock of their overall position, especially in view of changing notions of the minister's status, and the emergence of fresh concepts of his task. The time may well be ripe in Britain too for a full survey that would run across denominational lines, and may conceivably contribute to closer inter-church relations.

Secondly, the last sentence in the Niebuhr Report could justly be directed to the situation in Britain—'Our next step in the advancement of theological education must be the better instruction of the churches in the meanings and problems of that enterprise'. Are not British divinity schools constrained by this to ask at least whether they have approached creatively or imaginatively enough through the churches the crucial issue of recruitment to the ministry?

Further, in America there has been, as we have seen, a realistic endeavour to confront the problems of practical theology and to review critically the relationship of field-work to the Biblical, historical and theological understanding of Christianity. Although no easy answers have been found to questions raised, the liveliness with which the questions have been and are being asked augurs well. Are the theological colleges of Scotland and England looking at their time-honoured academic systems with a genuine openness of mind? Or would advisers of studies for pre-theological students in Scotland, for example, still abide by the traditional conceit that the best preparation for ministerial training is an Honours degree in classics, Semitic languages, or moral philosophy and logic? It may be that it still is. I simply ask these things to point up the need for corporate and co-operative examination of the position.

In particular, I have noticed since coming to the United States that every major theological school has a Professor of Christian Ethics. I do not know what the position is in England, but I believe I am right in saying that in the Scottish universities there is not at the moment a single professorship in Christian ethics. Is not this rather anomalous in the light of the present precariousness of the churches' hold upon society, and of the people's continuing expectancy that the churches and their ministries will give a lead both on personal ethics and on the great social issues of our day? Can the rising generation of ministers, relatively untrained in this strategic area, hope to match the moment as early as they might? I know, of course, that as far as the addition of new personnel to theological faculties in Britain is concerned, financial limitations do impose severe restrictions.

Nevertheless there are one or two signs—a cloud perhaps as yet no bigger than a man's hand—that British theological education also is entering a new era of constructive reappraisal. Dr. J. A. T. Robinson of Cambridge has recently written an article entitled, 'The Teaching of Theology for the Ministry',[1] in which he deals with current trends in theological education in Anglicanism, and offers some stimulating comments on the relation between the English Universities, Cambridge in particular, and the Anglican theological training colleges. His view is that there is a difference, and ought to be a 'healthy tension', between the teaching of theology in a University and the teaching of theology in a training school for the ministry. In the university theology should be set up as an academic discipline, to be read by anyone, not necessarily an ordinand of the Anglican Church, in the same way as history or modern languages. The university, as Robinson sees it, is devoted to the pursuit of truth, not primarily the promotion of faith. A university discipline, he feels, does not really admit of the more existential teaching, which should be a feature of the ministerial training college, inspiring the ordinand to strenuous application to the task of proclaiming the gospel in an ever-changing environment. The Anglican training college is the place for the fulfilment of vocational aims and ideals, and should provide opportunity for group field-work in parishes and secular jobs, so that out of the actual situations encountered there theoretical studies might develop. Dr. Robinson refers with enthusiasm to incipient Anglican experimentation in this direction.

For Scotland, Dr. George Macleod in *Only One Way Left* has visualised the institution, side by side with the old divinity schools of the universities, of a new kind of theological seminary. In it there would be during the first year engagement in Biblical, historical, and theological study, and community living with sharing in household chores, a summer spent labouring in heavy industry, a winter of group involvement in all the work of a large city parish with only one lecture per day, and then a final year of study, devotion and pastoral training. Interestingly a few American colleges, and notably Union Theological Seminary quite recently, have instituted the practice of an 'internship year' for students in the middle of their course, during which they go out to serve in a pastoral situation, or in the work of Christian education, etc.

In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of January, 1959 [lxx.], there appeared some penetrating comments on the Niebuhr Report, and then in the

[1] *Theology*, LXI. [December, 1958] 486 ff.

April issue a timely article by Professor John McIntyre on *The Structure of Theological Education*, in which he pointed to the need for reconstruction in Britain, and referred in particular to the tension between the American and British types of education. Here are further signs of an awakened concern in Scotland.

In the light of what has been said above, I now suggest the following conclusions.

(1) The most acute problem facing theological educators on both sides of the Atlantic is obviously that of the relation between the practical and the academic. The problem has by no means been solved in America.

(2.) Out of my experience in the U.S.A., I would say that in the face of reiterated pleas for the imparting of practical skills and techniques, we must everywhere beware that those engaged in the Practical Theology field should not be or become mere technicians. They must operate at a high academic level and from a sound theological basis.

(3) I cannot believe that the setting up of church vocational training colleges independently of University Faculties of Theology would afford a solution. Could any case then be made for theology in the University as a purely academic discipline? Is not the urgent need of our time rather the clear recognition on the part of 'theoretical' theologians within the existing structure that their teaching cannot escape being church-related or oriented towards the ministry in the modern world? At this point Scotland is probably in a healthier position than the American theological seminaries, for a far bigger percentage of Scottish Professors in the 'theoretical' subjects have had practical experience of the pastorate.

(4) It will be an unhappy day for Scottish theological education, if, in order to achieve the elasticity for which Dr. McIntyre appeals, it is conceived to be enough to take out old courses and add new ones as and when required. A haphazard approach on these lines has not infrequently resulted in curricular chaos in American schools. If there is to be reconstruction, it must be comprehensive reform, with a quite definite rationale for the exclusion or inclusion of any subject in relation to the total structure envisaged.

(5) The debate about theological education is likely to be fruitful only if theological teachers themselves show a real openness to the future, and are not bound by existing patterns, nor by the conviction that their own particular discipline far transcends all the rest in importance.

Religious Education

The Epistles in the Class-room

By Margaret Avery, O.B.E., B.A., S.Th., London

All who teach the Bible would agree that priority must be given to the life and teaching of Jesus Christ and the story of the Early Church. One or more Gospels or an outline using them all, together with the Acts of the Apostles, are found in every Syllabus. This, together with some reference to the Old Testament and to the relevance of Christianity to life in our own and every age, is the basic minimum.

The minimum, however, is not the ideal and if the Bible is to have any prestige, one lesson a week (often with no homework) is a mockery. Where the time-table allows of at least two lessons a week or sometimes three, more adequate teaching is possible and the New Testament Letters can take their due place in the Syllabus.

The Epistles can be used in many ways, of which *four* are worth considering in detail.

1. *General Approach.* Every teacher of Scripture will no doubt at some point explain what the Bible is. He will teach his pupils that the New Testament is a collection of little books and letters written by the Church for the Church, to meet special needs. This literature provided an authentic account of the work of Jesus and the beginnings of the Church's life and worship and threw light on urgent problems of faith and conduct. All of it proclaimed the Good News. Much more was written. What we have in the New Testament is what the Church felt bound to preserve. Gradually a common mind was reached in defining how much of this new material was to take its place alongside the Old Testament as Scripture. Secure among the chosen material were most of the New Testament Letters, though Hebrews and James and 2 Peter had a hard fight to get into the Canon. In the end all three won their way in. The authorship of Hebrews is an unsolved mystery. Origen, the greatest scholar among the Greek scholars, let it slip in under Paul's name but it was his private opinion that only God knew who wrote it.

So in the course of general teaching about the New Testament some reference must needs be made to the Epistles. The information can be

presented in an interesting way and children are quite ready to learn the names of the books of the New Testament, their order and the main point of each. They are quick to recognize the value of precise factual knowledge and enjoy collecting it.

When we have shown that the Epistles are part of the Church's early literature, two further general points need emphasis. The first is that the Letters are the earliest part of the New Testament, earlier than the Gospels although these come first in the lay-out and deal with material that is chronologically earlier than that of the Letters. To find that either Galatians or 1 Thessalonians is the earliest book in the New Testament is an interesting discovery. The early date of the Letters means that they are of great historical importance. Probably our most valuable literary reference to the Resurrection is 1 Co 15^{1-11}, for Paul, writing about A.D. 55, states that when he visited the Corinthians some five years earlier he had taught them the tradition he himself had 'received'. When? Probably at his conversion, from Ananias or some other disciple. Verses 3–7 sound like a primitive creed. The date of St. Paul's conversion is usually set in the early or middle years of the thirties of the first century, that is, very shortly after the Resurrection itself. It is clear that belief in the Resurrection goes back to the earliest days of the Church, no legendary aftermath but a part of primitive tradition. The Resurrection stories in the Gospels may be equally valuable as evidence but they did not assume so early the shape in which they have come down to us. I have found an average class of girls aged fourteen quite able to appreciate this point.

The second point worth stressing is the incidental nature of the New Testament Letters. They were written, as we write letters, to particular people for a particular purpose. Probably the writers never dreamed that they would survive. They were *real* letters and once our pupils have grasped this, Christianity itself becomes more real, moving out of a mysterious and perhaps unreal background on to the stage of history. Romans is an elaborate dissertation on the doctrine of salvation but its destination was a particular set of Roman Christians. Ephesians may have been a circular letter but the writer knew in which cities he expected it to circulate. It is interesting to speculate how surprised St. Paul might have been had he been told that his tactful note to Philemon was to take its place in Holy Writ; or that his injunction to Corinthian women on the wearing of veils was to regulate dress in church for nineteen centuries. The very casualness of many of his allusions to the essentials of Christianity makes his witness the more impressive. Nothing is so revealing as what is taken for granted.

Probably the apologetic value of the Epistles will not be appreciated before the fifth or sixth form stage but younger pupils can be helped to feel the genuineness of the New Testament Letters.

In impressing this point I have found it useful to preface the study of the Epistles with some reference to letter-writing in the first century, a century in some ways not unlike our own with its cosmopolitan civilization and widespread, rather superficial culture. Many of those to whom Paul's Letters were read could probably read and write themselves. Slaves were often highly educated and some at least of the commercial and artisan classes in the towns, from which Christians were drawn (see Ac 16 and 18), were literate and may well have been as intelligent and well informed as their British counterparts to-day. They were not likely, especially the Greeks among them, to accept what they were told untested.

Among first and second century letters that have survived, preserved in crocodile mummies or in dry sand covering the rubbish heaps of Ancient Egypt, one of the most interesting is a letter from an Egyptian boy away from home doing his military service in the Roman Army. Writing to his father he begs for a letter from home, gives news of escape from drowning, his prospects and his pay, sends greetings to the family and a little picture of himself as a link with home. Just so might a modern boy on National Service write to his people. In the same district was found a touching letter of condolence, another from a builder's labourer to his wife, another which assured the recipient that he need not worry about the rent! (See Finegan, *Light from the Ancient Past*; Bouquet, *Life in New Testament Times*; Caiger, *Bible and Spade*.) Caiger quotes a letter from a mother to her son, expressing anxiety about his health, and another from a schoolboy to his father, asking him not to 'fidget' about his Mathematics. One woman writes to another about the transport of timber down the River Meander.

The *form* of these letters is usually the same as that of those in the New Testament, *i.e.*, name of sender, name of person addressed, congratulations or good wishes or prayers, the body of the letter, farewell, date and place of writing, and the Greek vocabulary is markedly similar. A 'B' form in a Secondary Modern School (fourth year) showed keen interest in this material and proceeded to study with zest Philemon, Philippians and parts of 1 Corinthians which they no longer regarded as dull and archaic but as real human documents.

2. *Linking the Epistles with the Acts of the Apostles.* Stories from the Acts can be told to junior children but the book is not studied systematically until the Secondary stage either in the second, or, more rarely, the third year, or as a

set book in the G.C.E. examination. Can Acts be supplemented with material from the Epistles?

The answer depends on the intelligence of the pupils. Acts is arresting and dramatic; it is also a long book which confronts the young student with a passage of history in which God works through a large number of varied personalities. The main theme of the Church's expansion under the guidance of the Holy Spirit is clear enough but there is much to master and weaker pupils should probably concentrate on the text of Acts with only very occasional reference to the Epistles. Abler pupils, however, can be encouraged to explore the Letters, in one of the good modern versions now available (for example, that of J. B. Phillips or Dr. Wand). These are essential for intelligent study.

The Epistles are naturally most easily related to the latter half of Acts, where Paul is the central figure. They can be fitted into the story in two ways, that is, we can either refer to them when we meet the place to which they are addressed or we can note at which point in the story they were written.

Let us consider these two points in more detail. The class has been reading the account of Paul's first missionary journey and has learned how Paul retraced his steps from Derbe to Antioch, consolidating his work by appointing elders in each Church. The question naturally arises—How did these Churches fare when Paul had left? Assuming that the term 'Galatia' could cover these four towns, we know that they were unstable and that Paul strove hard to save them from false teachers who insisted on their becoming Jews before they could become Christians. The Galatian Letter is too difficult for detailed study at this stage, but as the status of Gentile Christians is the issue in Ac 15, a brief reference to the content of Galatians is quite relevant—reference to the attacks made on Paul and his passionate self-defence (Gal 1 and 2), reference to the intensity of his desire to save them (3^{1}) and to the joy and freedom of a life based on faith in Christ rather than on obedience to the details of Jewish Law (4^{6} 5^{1} 5^{22-23}). The reference to Paul's large handwriting in 6^{11} is an interesting personal touch.

Still more interesting from another angle is the Philippian Letter. A study of events at Philippi as recorded in Ac 16 suggests that the Church there was a generous and friendly one. Gratefully Paul accepted from the Philippians financial help (2 Co 11^{9}) and poured out his heart to them without restraint (Ph 1^{3-26} 2^{12-13} 4). It was, however, a strangely assorted Church, including a well-to-do Greek woman at the head of a dyeing firm and her household, a slave who had been a clairvoyante and probably her circle, and a minor Roman official who would gather round him others of his class in a predominantly Roman town. It is not surprising that the one fault Paul has to find with this devout and loyal community is a tendency to fall out with each other (Ph 1^{27}–2^{13} $4^{2,3}$).

The other way of referring to the Letters (which does not exclude the method just described) is to fit them into Paul's life at the point where he wrote them; for example, to note that the Corinthian Letters were written from Ephesus amid stress and danger in 55 B.C. Constant elements in Paul's life were bitter controversy and the threat of death. Advanced pupils will be able to discover from their commentaries at which point Paul is believed to have written to this or that group and why, sending his lieutenants with a stream of messages.

3. *The Study of 'Purple' Passages and Learning by Heart.* Every now and then Paul's rather colloquial Greek rises into eloquence under stress of strong feeling and the rhythm of poetry makes it unforgettable. Such passages have long been quoted in Syllabuses for 'repetition' and read out, sometimes too frequently, at school prayers.

It is clearly desirable that boys and girls should commit to memory such passages as 1 Co 13, Gal 5^{22-23}, Ph 2^{1-11} 4^{4-8}, Eph 3^{14-21} 6^{10-20} and much of Ro 12. It is equally desirable that they should learn by heart intelligently. The context and meaning of each passage that is to be learned should be made clear. The great passage on Love (1 Co 13), for example, is addressed to a showy and divided Church, split by competing factions and ambitions and superficial even in the service of God. Ecstatic speech is rated more highly than spiritual insight or moral goodness. Paul rebukes the Corinthians for their exhibitionism, arranges the gifts of the Spirit in order of importance, and then points out that no gift is of any use without the charity which they sorely lack. I would mention that Corinth was famous for beautiful metal ware, musical instruments and mirrors in polished copper of the kind found in a Roman villa under a blitzed house in Canterbury in 1942 (1 Co $13^{1, 12}$).

Passages learned by rote are remembered better if they are written down and also if they are discussed. An illustrated anthology of great passages is an interesting exercise popular in lower Secondary forms and older pupils could well use Ro 12 to lead on to a discussion on how Christians should bear witness in the world to-day.

4. *The Study of Individual Letters*—a topic which will be dealt with in the following article when we shall consider the use of geography, history and recent archæology in such study, the relation of the Letter to contemporary pagan thought and its contribution to Christian doctrine.

Literature

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

Much interest is sure to be awakened by Emil Brunner's *The Letter to the Romans: A Commentary* (Lutterworth Press; 21s. net). The original, *Der Römerbrief*, was first published in 1938 by J. G. Oncken Verlag, Kassel. The present English translation is based upon one made by H. A. Kennedy from the 1956 German edition, and the English text of the Epistle used is that of the Revised Standard Version. In Brunner's view the Epistle is 'the chapter of destiny of the Christian Church', and in the opening words of the Introduction he quotes the words of Luther in 1522: 'This letter is the principal part of the New Testament and the purest gospel, which surely deserves the honour that a Christian man should not merely know it off by heart word for word, but that he should be occupied with it daily as the daily bread of the soul. For it can never be read too often and too well. And the more it is used the more delicious it becomes and the better it tastes. . . .' Throughout the centuries of Christian history, Brunner declares, the fate of the Church of Christ has time and again depended on the understanding and evaluation of it.

Very little space is devoted by Brunner to questions of Introduction. He explains the circumstances in which Paul came to write the letter, dates it in the period A.D. 54 to 58, and says that the place of composition is very probably Corinth. He says that the present tendency is to regard ch. 16 as a genuine part of the Epistle, but that the final verses have probably been added by another hand, though in content they fit very well into the whole. 'What a power of the Spirit', he writes, 'must have been alive in this Paul to have been able to dictate such a work in a few nights.' In this letter, he affirms, 'God Himself wants to speak to us'. In the Commentary as a whole little or no attention is given to critical or textual questions, or to the meaning of Greek words and constructions; the dominant aim is to explain what the Apostle means and what God has to say to us still. In the main the Commentary is a paraphrase and a homily. After expounding 3^{1-8} he writes: 'And now Paul has reached the stage when he can strike the decisive blow against every kind of human presumption, so that he may crush it before going on to speak of what the whole letter points to: God's gracious act of reconciliation in Jesus Christ'.

The English reader who has been brought up on Sanday and Headlam will miss much that he would like to see in this Commentary, but he cannot fail to be moved by Brunner's volcanic style and robust assertions. Whether Paul speaks of himself in 7^{14-25}, he says, cannot be answered by a single Yes or No. The second part of this famous passage, he says, deals with the Christian, namely, in so far as he is not in Christ but in sin; its theme is precisely the same as that of the first part, man under the Law, that is, man outside Christ. In treating 9^{6-29} he writes: 'Of a double decree (predestination), one leading to eternal life and the other to eternal damnation, this passage teaches just as little as any other part of Holy Scripture' (p. 87). He declares ch. 11 'is perhaps the most daring that Paul ever wrote'. Of the so-called 'ethical' part of the Epistle from ch. 12 onwards he says that, as the fruit grows from the sap of the tree, this instruction for the true Christian life grows out of what has been previously told us about God's merciful dealings with us. In a valuable Appendix he explains the leading ideas in Paul's teaching.

This moving Commentary is not one which will lead us to scrap other commentaries, but it is one which we shall do well to read along with them, especially for devotional purposes.

VINCENT TAYLOR

THE LORDSHIP OF CHRIST

Professor Jean Bosc in his book, *The Kingly Office of the Lord Jesus Christ* (Oliver and Boyd; 16s. net), first published in 1957 and now helpfully translated into lucid English by Professor J. K. S. Reid, is seeking to make a contribution to current ecumenical discussion on the Lordship of Christ over the Church and over the world. This is 'an attempt to outline a precise Christological doctrine upon the ground plan of the mission of the Church in the actual world'. To the author 'only this understanding makes possible and legitimate the subsequent consideration of the problem concerning the active aspects of the mission of the Church in its relations with the world', which he hopes to undertake later.

The book begins with an examination of the doctrine of the three offices which Professor Bosc finds rooted in the anointing of Christ for His work as Mediator; and an examination of the kingly office in the doctrine and preaching of the Church with special emphasis on the Second Barmen Declaration. The heart of the book consists of the title *The Lord* giving particular attention to the

Resurrection, Ascension, Heavenly Session and Second Coming of Christ; and of the phrases *Head of the Church* and *Lord over the world*.

For students of any theological persuasion there is here interesting illumination on the theology of John Calvin and the Heidelberg Catechism, on the difference between Lutheran and Reformed Christology and on the theology of Karl Barth, as well as, of course, much common Christian conviction that our Lord Jesus Christ is Head of the Church and Lord of the world.

But as a contribution to ecumenical discussion it suffers because it is so clearly an attempt to state a more precise Christology for those readers, and for those readers only, who share Professor Bosc's undiscussed and unpersuasively presented assumptions. If a reviewer who does not share them may presume to state them, they appear to be the absolute infallibility of the Chalcedonian Definition of Faith accepted as prolegomena to a literal, and apparently non-historical treatment of the Scriptures. For those who accept these assumptions the result is, of course, great gain in the cumulative focusing of Scriptural and historical affirmations of the kingly office of Christ, for those who do not, the observations may be permitted that as there is never likely to be one and only one theological point of view the language of persuasion should always be present in theological discourse, and that if we have learnt in the last thirty years that we need a theological in addition to an historical approach to the Scriptures, we seem now to need an historical approach to the Scriptures in addition to a theological one.

H. Cunliffe-Jones

SPIRITUAL MATERIALISM

The teaching of Zen has become familiar during the last thirty-five years, largely through the works of Professor D. T. Suzuki. Its clearest exposition for Westerners now appears in *Living Zen*, by Mr. Robert Linssen (Allen and Unwin; 30s. net). The manuscript was prepared in French and this translation, by Diana Abrahams-Curiel, appears to be faithful to the original. It is a pity that Chinese words are given in French romanized form, instead of following the Wade system (for example, Houei K'o, instead of the well-known Hui K'o); but they are still recognizable.

It was about A.D. 520 that Zen (Chinese: *Ch'an*) began to appear as a distinctive form of Buddhism, but during the present century it has not only made considerable headway in Japan, it has impressed several Westerners. Zen now claims to be the highest form of Buddhism and to follow most logically the teaching of the Founder. It does not depend upon ritual, or any particular text, or upon philosophy, and it is hardly a religion except in a very restricted sense. Although Zen is often translated 'meditation' it does not necessarily demand intellectual apprehension; Zen claims to be LIFE. For example, there is an ancient story of Hui-Neng, who, while selling firewood from door to door, overheard some one reciting a Buddhist *sutra*. He was so gripped by the clear exposition of its meaning that he experienced a 'breaking-through', and saw his true self and reality in one intuitive flash of insight as one and the same. This experience is called in Japanese *satori* and is indeed the ideal of Zen. Everything is seen in totality, without any differentiation. Self and emotion no longer have meaning or influence, and a man knows peace and life.

Many of us have recoiled from harsh dualism, such as that emphasized by the Gnostics, but in Zen we are faced with its opposite, a Monism which describes itself as 'a homogeneous Totality-that-is-One, both physical and spiritual'. In support of this contention the author quotes from Socrates, Sir James Jeans, Bertrand Russell and Krishnamurti, who certainly make strange bed-fellows. He ransacks psychology and physics for analogies, but although he reveals considerable knowledge of these subjects, we retain an uneasy conviction that argument from analogy is precarious. The impression that the Sages of Zen are trying to grasp a cloud is confirmed by some of the expressions used, for example, omnipenetrability, ideation, transluminous plenitude, unicity and inexistence. Or, by such wording as 'The creative impulse of "Cosmic Mind" is compared to the lightning-flash of an Eternal Present. From the moment when a certain inner transparence is established in us we realize perfect availability to this cosmic impulse. When we are totally absent to ourselves the coincidence of the Present that lies in the depths and of the surface present is established.'

It is well known that a sharp paradox (in Zen, a *koan*) may sometimes bring illumination and insight, but can *satori* be the final end which results in life? That our doubt is well founded is illustrated by the career of one of the most brilliant Buddhists of this century, the Abbot Lo Miao-Chi. In Kyoto he was profoundly influenced by Dr. Suzuki, whom he greatly admired. While resident at a Zen monastery he experienced the 'breaking-through'. He became a changed man, but it proved insufficient, and he was led, step by step, to find true life in Jesus Christ. But first there had to come repentance, and a reckoning with sin, before release and helpful witnessing could take place.

H. F. Wickings

COMPARATIVE RELIGION

It is many years now since Dr. A. C. Bouquet began to write on the topics covered by his title, and his latest book—*The Christian Faith and Non-Christian Religions* in the ' Library of Constructive Theology ' series (Nisbet ; 25s. net)—is a comprehensive study in Comparative Religion of which the purpose is clear and the sincerity with which it is carried out is unmistakable. He makes no extravagant claims for the pre-eminent value of Christianity in relation to other faiths, but he is absolutely convinced of such value. What is needed, he thinks, is careful examination of the principles of Christianity rather than criticism of their unworthy exponents. While he is sure that a world faith is necessary and must be some form of Christianity, he frankly admits the feeling that ' taken as a whole Christianity as it stands is not yet quite fit to fulfil that function ', and again—more drastically and pointedly—he says, ' The sober truth, I fear, is that a great deal (only too much) of Christianity, and especially American Christianity, is as unfitted to guide the future of religion in the world as the Marxists of Russia and their friends are to dispose of it.'

He repeatedly gives solid grounds for these severe opinions, and he makes it quite clear that he does not like Kraemer's attitude or that of rigid fundamentalists or authoritarians. But it must not be thought that his reasoning is mainly negative ; in his continuously expanding chapters he gives good grounds for the faith that is in him, and carries conviction, even though the scheme of his book as a whole is not quite so orderly as it might be, and—greatly to our sorrow—he does not provide an index.

His plan is to furnish us with a metaphysical foundation, paying due regard to both science and philosophy, then to give a rapid survey of pre-Christian religion, the rise and expansion of Christianity, analysing as he goes the principle of diffusion, and so on to a comprehensive survey of the present state of non-Christian religion and a profound treatment of the theological revaluation which has taken place in Christian thought during the last hundred years.

He has an exceedingly valuable chapter on the doctrine of the Logos. His treatment of non-Christian religions is excellent, sympathetic and comprehensive, and he discusses most valuably the problems of indigenization, severely condemning on the one hand the neglect of elements in non-Christian culture which might usefully be incorporated and, on the other hand, the indiscriminate adoption of doubtful practices, suggesting the warning principle that resemblance in custom and ceremony does not necessarily mean resemblance in thought. His discussion of Marxism is straightforward and practical, a little facile perhaps and wanting in depth but necessary brevity excuses this, and he leaves openings for a certain amount of useful co-operation. Incidentally he reminds us that it was Kingsley and not Marx who first spoke of religion being ' the opium of the people '.

The concluding chapter on the striking changes in the attitude of Christianity during the last hundred years gives us a useful survey of the leading writers who have brought about the alterations in theological valuation which have brightened the prospects of a more understanding approach to non-Christian religions and suggested relationships which will by no means diminish the claim to the pre-eminence of Christianity but at the same time prevent misunderstandings which are unfounded and which do less than justice both to the non-Christian religions and to Christianity itself as interpreted by its leading modern exponents.

W. S. URQUHART

EVELYN UNDERHILL

About the systematic ' cultivation of the spiritual life ' there are of course diverse opinions. To some, the very phrase suggests a false dichotomy between the life of human relationships and the life toward God ; many not irreligious people are distrustful of what seems to them the too intense preoccupation with the inner life, the over-eager desire to order its movements, which sometimes appears to result in an excessive interest in states of mind for their own sakes. Miss Margaret Cropper's affectionate and moving study of *Evelyn Underhill* (Longmans ; 25s. net) will certainly compel readers to weigh such questions. Miss Underhill was profoundly versed in the literature and in the practice of ' devotion ' ; her studies in mysticism and other writings caused her to be regarded as a specialist in worship ; rather to her own surprise, she found herself a spiritual director to whom many looked for guidance, and a valued teacher of the Church. But, with all her strenuous and systematic application to the disciplines and techniques of the life of devotion, Evelyn Underhill was no mere introvert and there was in her nothing of the recluse. On the contrary, she was a very practical friend to people of all sorts and conditions, she had a wide range of interests—sailing, the theatre, wild flowers, cats !—she was full of humour and sound commonsense. And it might well be claimed that the very richness of her humanity was mainly due to the disciplines of her hidden life, her practice of withdrawal, ' recollectedness ', adoration.

This well-written study does not pretend to set forth the substance of Miss Underhill's published

works, but it does vividly portray the woman herself—in her home, in her friendships, in her inner struggles, in her not too easy passage through theocentric mysticism to a deeply-held Christ-centred faith. Not the least interesting passages in the book are those in which we read long letters to Miss Underhill from Baron von Hügel, who was for years her spiritual director and much-loved friend.

A. J. Boyd

THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN

No New Testament student will approach the work of the late Professor Charles C. Torrey with anything but respect. There has now appeared posthumously a volume of his, entitled *The Apocalypse of John* (Oxford University Press; 40s. net).

The thesis of this book is twofold—first, that the Revelation is a literal translation of an Aramaic original, and second, that it was written in A.D. 68.

The choice of that date immediately presents problems. Dr. Torrey is sure that the writer of the Revelation knew Matthew's Gospel; if the Revelation was written in A.D. 68, and if its writer knew Matthew, then the date of Matthew must be about the middle of the first century, as, indeed, Dr. Torrey has previously argued.

Dr. Torrey will accept none of the common explanations of the 'linguistic anarchy' of the Revelation. This anarchy is not due to haste; it is not due to a deliberate flouting of grammar in contempt of Hellenism; it is not due to ignorance; it is not the translation Greek of some one who thought in Aramaic; it is not due to a badly preserved text. It is due to the fact that it was written in Aramaic, and then meticulously, word for word, translated, by one who believed in the verbal inspiration of that which was original.

Dr. Torrey goes on to test this theory against a great many passages in a long series of critical notes; and he finally adds a new translation of the Revelation.

It cannot be denied that there are arguments in favour of Dr. Torrey's thesis. An obvious one is that the simplest explanation of the number of the Beast, 666, is that it is based on the Hebrew version of Nero's name, Nerōn Qesar.

But there is another side to this. The Greek of the Revelation is curious Greek. It is what Benson called 'the grammar of ungrammar'. Two things have to be held in mind. First, the writer of it frequently quite clearly knew what he was doing; second, it is significant that the Greek of the papyri throws more than a little light on the Greek of the Revelation, and this is something which Dr. Torrey completely disregards.

This leads us to certain conclusions. No New Testament student can afford to neglect this book; it is a book, written by an expert in his subject, and a book of first class importance. But—and there is a 'but'—it seems to at least one reader that Dr. Torrey has found a key which unlocks some doors, and with it he has tried to unlock every door. He was so in love with his own thesis that he did not see that there could be any other. This is a book for the technical scholar; it is to be possessed and to be read and to be studied, but it still remains to be weighed in the balance, and it may well be found that it has over-stated its case, good as the case is.

William Barclay

PRAYER

Of the first of the books here to be considered we are told in a Preface by Dr. Leslie Weatherhead that it is not 'merely another of the thousand books on prayer'; this book, it is said, is different. The word 'different' indeed occurs not infrequently in the Prefaces and 'blurbs' of such books, but this book does something to establish the claim. It is called *Reality and Prayer* (Hodder and Stoughton; 12s. 6d. net), by John Magee, an American Professor of Philosophy and Religion. The book begins by considering the theoretical difficulties which assail prayer, particularly intercessory prayer, in a scientific age, and then proceeds through the various parts of prayer, adoration, and so on, finishing with some chapters on meditation and mystical prayer. The claim to originality rests on the wide reading of the author and his relating the aspects of prayer to other branches of learning. In the chapter on 'Science, Law and Prayer', reference is made to Max Planck's theories, of which a somewhat dubious use is often made in this discussion; yet the chapter makes some valuable points. Confession is related to modern discoveries in psychology, and intercession to parapsychology, especially the work of Professor Rhine. The argument is also profusely illustrated from ancient and modern literature. Indeed, the wealth of quotations is somewhat excessive. The traditional patterns of Christian prayer and the traditional affirmations of Christian theology are not, as one might fear, almost explained away by these related disciplines; thus the author does not assert that intercession *is* telepathy but sensibly discusses the relation between the two. Thus we have a work on prayer by an author who is well aware of what occupies the minds of so many of his contemporaries.

Prayer is the Secret (Arthur James; 12s. 6d.

net), by the Rev. Reginald E. O. White, applies to the Acts and the Epistles the methods which the author used in an earlier book on the Gospels. The Scriptural passages on prayer are gathered under such titles as 'The Secret of Personal Victory' and 'The Secret of Inward Serenity', and suitably illustrated.

Somewhat similar is *Secrets of Answered Prayer* (Arthur James; 12s. 6d. net), by Dr. Cyril H. Powell, M.Litt. Here the framework of the book consists of brief accounts of the lives of notable men of prayer, some of them still living; each is used to illustrate some aspect of the power of prayer; and into each such chapter other relevant examples are introduced. Several of the examples are of the kind which culminates in such words as 'This can hardly have been a coincidence,' but Dr. Powell also shows himself aware of the difficulties of this kind of argument. His footnote on Gethsemane raises so many questions so briefly that it would be better expanded or omitted.

Two things seem to be missing in all these books. There needs to be more theology. How is our prayer affected by the fact that we have put on Christ, are in Christ, die and rise with Christ, feed on Christ, are members of Christ's Body, by the fact that Christ makes intercession for us, that the Spirit pleads for us with groanings that cannot be uttered? There also needs to be more about public worship. How are our private prayers related to the fact that we are baptized, that we share in the Lord's Supper, that we join with others in corporate devotion? Admittedly a book on one aspect of the Christian life cannot cover the whole of theology; yet Christian prayer, whatever may be said of prayer in general, cannot be considered in isolation from these subjects, which are scantily treated in such books.

Books of prayers are as numerous as books about prayer, but one by Dr. William Barclay is sure to be popular; this is *The Plain Man's Book of Prayers* (Collins [Fontana Books]; 2s. 6d. net). After an introduction on the various parts of prayer, it contains a Bible reading and morning and evening prayers for thirty days, for four Sundays, and for certain festivals; also prayers for special occasions in the home, and a list of Bible readings for a year, compiled by Dr. William C. Somerville.

Prayers for Daily Use (Hodder and Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Samuel H. Miller, a distinguished American theologian, is a collection of prayers, classified by occasions and seasons (with some curious omissions), suitable for public or private use, in the 'free' rather than the 'liturgical' style.

A. Raymond George

FAITH OR RELIGION

It was said of a much loved theological teacher in Cambridge—and it may be true of many others—that what he said mattered less than the way in which he said it. The reminiscence is provoked by the reading of Werner Pelz' *Irreligious Reflections on the Christian Church* (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net). The reference is not to the style, the staccato idiom of which may be more pleasing and intelligible to the under-forties than to the others who may well have the greater need to listen to what Mr. Pelz is saying. It is a matter of the passionate conviction behind the words. The 'religion' subsumed in the title covers the 'many faiths which men can and do produce in their all too human way' in contradistinction to the faith which is the gift of Christ. Under this judgment is brought much of the thinking in the Church to-day, and, more importantly, many of the unexamined presuppositions which lie behind the living and doing of many Christians. There are elements in the book which cannot but be described as jejune. Some of it, especially in the negative and condemnatory vein, smacks of the angry-young-manship fashionable in literary circles of another kind. But what shines out of, and away beyond, all this is something for which there is no other word but prophetic. Here is authentic witness to the grace of God by a believer who has found it, or rather Him, sufficient, and that in testing circumstances beyond what has come the way of most of his readers, and who burns to communicate, not what he has discovered, but what has been revealed to him. There is much in the book which will irritate the reader. He will be wise to consider where to draw the line between mere irritation and the sense of coming under judgment.

Marcus Ward

We give a welcome to *An Archbishop of the Reformation*, by Dr. Eric E. Yelverton, O.B.E. (Epworth Press; 18s. 6d. net). The Archbishop in question is Laurentius Petri of Uppsala, who attained that high dignity at the age of thirty-two and held it for forty-two years, from 1531 to 1573. He was thus responsible for the development of the Church of Sweden during the formative period of the Reformation. It is his liturgical work which chiefly engages the present author, and we have here a thoroughly documented study without parallel in English. A postscript shows that the contemporary movement known in Sweden as Church Renewal, a movement resembling the Oxford Movement in England, claims that in its revival of the sacramental life of the Church it is returning to the Church of Sweden's historic position as expressed by this great Reformation leader.

New and Living Way, by Fr. Antony Snell, S.S.M. (Faith Press; 18s. net), has as its sub-title *An Explanation of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. It lives up to its title, for it is a careful, painstaking and scholarly exposition of the Epistle by one who knows it and loves it.

Without committing himself to it, Father Snell makes the most of the view that Barnabas may have written the Epistle, as Tertullian states. If so, it may have been written by Barnabas to a group of Hebrew Christians in Cyprus, for whom for a time he had had pastoral responsibility, and from whom he was separated. If that is the case, the date of the Epistle is most likely before A.D. 70.

The recipients of the letter were Jewish Christians, and their danger was that they were becoming so faint-hearted as to become doubtful of the full saving grace of Christ, and so were becoming inclined to sit back in reliance on the general Jewish religion of their childhood, forgetting that the old covenant was provisional and had been replaced by the new covenant. There is an excellent section on the Person and Work of Christ in the Epistle; and there are good sections on its connexion with Alexandrian thought, and on certain great words in it.

The commentary is painstaking and really gets to grips with the text. This will be an excellent book both for private reading and group study.

The Destiny of Man (Hodder and Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net) consists of a series of articles published in 'The Sunday Times'. It begins with Sir Julian Huxley's article on 'Man's Place in Nature' in which he claimed that man is now the only type of organism capable of any further evolution and that it is our business as men to discover and realize new possibilities for life. Bishop J. W. C. Wand and the Rev. T. Corbishley, S.J., are among the six eminent people representing religious, philosophical and scientific points of view who contribute papers commenting on aspects of Sir Julian's, and they present the cautions which immediately spring to the mind of the moralist and theologian when such a topic is under discussion. Perhaps more devastating is Miss Rebecca West in her demonstration that the evolutionary process must now deal with two deadly enemies—over-population and radio activity.

It would be very difficult for anyone to write an uninteresting book about Origen. Dr. Hugh T. Kerr, in his pamphlet (forty-three pages) *The First Systematic Theologian: Origen of Alexandria* (Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey [Princeton Pamphlets No. 11]; 50 cents), has written an excellent introduction to the thought of Origen. Although S. D. F. Salmond called the genius of Origen 'titanic', although Dean Inge called him 'the most learned Biblical scholar of antiquity', although J. J. O'Meara has quoted with approval the saying that 'there has been no truly great man in the Church who did not love him a little,' Origen has always been suspect. He has never been given the title 'doctor'. There have been those who felt that, although it can be held that Origen made Christianity intellectually respectable in an age when it was held in some justifiable contempt, it might also be said that he did not so much Christianize paganism as he paganized Christianity.

There have been few more adventurous thinkers than Origen, with his belief in universal restoration, and his idea of an expanding universe where 'whole nations of souls are stored away'.

Within its limits this book does real justice to Origen, honestly expounding and wisely evaluating his teaching. Valuable in itself, this book might well be the basis for a much fuller study, and its author could write that fuller study, for, if we mistake not, he writes of Origen *con amore*.

A book of sermons by James Reid of Eastbourne, as he will always be known, scarcely needs any commendation. *Living in Depth* (Saint Andrew Press; 21s. net) contains Dr. Reid's own selection of sixty-four sermons which have already appeared in the columns of 'The British Weekly'.

There are few preachers with such a mastery of brief simplicity, and few preachers who preach so much to our condition as Dr. Reid does. The book has eight sections—The Foundations of Faith, Faith in Action, The Secret of Power, The Meaning of Forgiveness, The Practice of Prayer, Where Love Is, In the Light of Christ, A Life of Hope.

Dr. Reid has the gift for the swift and flashing illustration. 'An easy-going man whose wife had to support the home, said to a friend, "I don't worry". "No", was the caustic reply, "You leave that to your wife." A soldier in God's army must take his share of hardships and carry his own pack.' 'A negro Salvationist was found one day kneeling in front of a tablet in a church commemorating the conversion there of General Booth. "O Lord, do it again", he was praying over and over again. As we read the story of Pentecost and think of the world to-day and of the impotence of the Church, the same prayer will come to our lips, "O Lord, do it again".'

This book is beautifully printed and produced. It is a joy to handle and a joy to read, and these sermons will be the begetter of many sermons in the minds of others.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

How Much For It?

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'. . . one pearl of great price . . .'—Mt 13[46].

I've had a wonderful Saturday afternoon. I've been climbing over mountains of burnt, battered and broken metal, looking for treasure.

The fact is that I need a part for my car. My car has reached the age when decent dealers don't recognise its existence. When I went into the agents in a big city earlier this week, holding the broken bit in my hands, the assistant looked at me condescendingly and sniffed: 'I'm afraid, sir (with an extra emphasis on the 'sir' which was very noticeable), that it is quite impossible to get parts as far back as this'.

But ten miles away we have a breaker's yard. It is a forlorn looking place, run by two brothers who treat me with splendid familiarity. 'Get inside and scrat and see if you can find it,' they say, welcomingly. Now, I've spent a wonderful afternoon with Bill and Fred and their hundreds of old crocks. I've scrambled over them all, screwdriver and spanner in hand, undoing things here, lifting bits there, all the while looking for the precious part I need. And, after a long time, I have had to come home—without it.

Now I come to tot up, I have driven a hundred and forty miles and visited four towns to find that part. I have spent hours trying to persuade every blacksmith I know to have a go at making one like it. I have wasted a whole afternoon looking for that single bit of metal. How much is it worth? Well, if I could get it new, it would cost about five shillings. You can work out how much it has cost me *not* to get it.

Which all goes to show that things are often worth much more than they seem. If I had found that part this afternoon, you would have sniffed and said, 'What a rusty old bit of tin'. But I would have gone to Fred or Bill and said, 'How much for it?' and they could have asked any sum they liked and I would have paid up gladly.

Once a sea captain told Dr. Henry Drummond how, some years before, his ship sank. He had to take to the boats with his men. The night fell, and the sea grew rough; the lifeboats were loaded down to the gunwhales. Presently they saw the lights of a passing steamer. How could they attract her attention in the darkness? Someone in one of the boats found a battered old lantern with a bit of candle still in it. They searched their clothes to see whether anyone had a match. They found just one. They passed it round reverently, one to the other. At last it reached the captain, 'Go on, skipper', the men said, 'you light the lantern.' And they crouched round him to shelter him from the wind as he struck the match. The captain told Drummond that, in all his years at sea, though he had faced danger and borne responsibility galore, he never trembled so much as when he held that single match between his fingers and struck it to light the candle.

How much for a single match? *You* can buy a boxful for twopence. But that captain knew that a match is worth the lives of a score of men.

I'm always a bit chary of pulling our Lord's parables to pieces and asking what they teach: they teach so many different things to so many different people at so many different times. But I think I shall understand something about that 'one pearl of great price' after this afternoon's search. And I shall remember that the Great Pearl Merchant came looking in some strange places for His jewels. They are not all beautiful, nor all precious, to the inexpert eye. They are ordinary folk like you and me, who don't always want to be found. And the cost of the deal? The story said it was 'all that he had'.

How much to make us His own? The last pages of the Gospels tell us. It was treasure indeed.

Not Too Fast

By the Reverend F. Vernon Moss, B.A., Loughborough

'Let us run with patience'.—He 12[1].

I think those notices one sees on the rear windows of motor cars are called 'flashes'. The other day I saw one which looked rather ridiculous. It read 'Don't follow me. I'm lost'. So I remembered other 'flashes' I had seen, and much more sensible. I hope to be putting one on my car window in a few days, and it will read, 'Please pass—running in'.

You will most of you know what that means. The engine has been rebuilt, and in it will be a lot of new parts. As they fit rather tightly, the garage man says it is not wise to race the newly built engine. For the first five hundred miles the speed should not exceed thirty miles per hour. It is best to run it in gradually, until the friction parts get used to each other.

It amazes me sometimes to see brand new cars being driven at sixty miles per hour. This is ruinous to new engines and may damage them for life. One car manufacturer was so concerned about this that he invented a new 'flash'—'If you see this car exceeding thirty miles per hour please report its number to us'. Here are three points that we might remember.

1. *Courtesy.* 'Please pass—running in' is a courteous 'flash'. It at once explains the situation, and doesn't interfere with the privileges of others. And we want you always to be courteous.

2. *Care.* We should always respect what belongs to others. The driver who breaks the rule with these new cars is treating with disrespect something that belongs to another. He says, 'It isn't mine: I don't care: I want to get home'. He is breaking the Golden Rule of Jesus.

3. *Patience.* I like this idea of 'running in' the new engine, and getting it used to its work gradually. It is not unlike breaking in a young colt. What a good time you have compared with the boys and girls of other days! They were driven hard! Put to work at very tender years; few schools to go to; and now it is all so different. During these years you are being prepared for life. So, enjoy your fun and games and school and church. Learn all you can and be as good as you can. Later on life will bring responsibility and very important things to do.

The Christian Year

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Saints in Hiding

BY THE REVEREND D. H. C. READ, D.D., NEW YORK

'Now when they beheld the boldness of Peter and John, and had perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men, they marvelled; and they took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus'.—Ac 4^{13} (R.V.).

Some years ago two men were travelling in a train in England. One of them stared for a long time at another passenger; then turned to his friend and said: 'I bet you half-a-crown that's the Archbishop of Canterbury'. 'I'll take you', said the other, I don't believe it is.' So the first went over to the stranger and said: 'Excuse me, but aren't you the Archbishop of Canterbury?' The gentleman addressed laid down his paper, glared at him, and said: 'You get to blazes out of here and mind your own business!' Whereupon the other returned to his friend saying, 'The bet's off. We still don't know if he's the Archbishop or not.'

That story raises for us a much more important question than that of recognizing an Archbishop. How, in fact, do you recognize a Christian? Perhaps you might say that the outburst of the stranger in the train proved not only that he was not the Archbishop, but also that he was not even a Christian. But we couldn't say even that for certain. In any case we can't just apply a negative rule. All people who refrain from being rude on trains are not necessarily Christians. Is there any way in our everyday life by which we can recognize a Christian man or woman?

There is no outward sign by which you can at once recognize a Christian. To draw the portrait of a Christian is as hard as to attempt to delineate the features of our Lord Himself. Every artist imparts to the lineaments of Jesus something of the spirit of his own age, and we have the Christs of the ancient world—Roman Christs, Byzantine Christs, Medievai Christs, Victorian Christs, and Christs with the features of the African, the Indian, the Eskimo, and the Japanese. Every man is reflected in His face; and the face of His followers is the face of every man and every woman. The universal Christ draws all men to Himself.

You cannot, therefore, recognize a Christian by his outward shape. Has it then to do with the contours of his mind, the way he thinks? In our text we read that the authorities who had Peter and John arrested, considered them 'unlearned and ignorant men'. The Revised Standard Version is slightly more accurate in translating 'uneducated, common men'. That is what they were, these apostles. Jesus did not say: 'Come unto Me all ye with I.Q. over 100', and there has never been a period in Christian history when the mind alone was the criterion of discipleship.

It's not the outward appearance; it's not the mental ability; nor is it cultural interests or even moral passion that make us recognize a Christian. A man or woman can be a great artist without being a Christian, and some of the most fervent moral crusaders of our day completely reject the Christian creed. By what sign, then, can a Christian be recognized? It almost looks as if we had exhausted the possibilities.

Could it be that there is a sense in which a Christian is not meant to be recognized? 'Ye are the salt of the earth', said Jesus. I know when I am eating a dish that is properly salted—or, at least, I should at once if it were not. But the salt is invisible. That other unsalted dish looks exactly the same. The strongest Christian influence in our world has always been that of the unrecognized—the saints in hiding. The distinguishing mark upon them is the simple contagion of Christ, the reflection of His spirit, the presence of His grace. In the words of our text they have 'been with Jesus'.

This is the definition of a saint. The word has come to have a semi-official sound as it is conferred on certain men and women in Christian history. Or it has taken on a miserable perverted connotation as in the word 'sanctimonious'. Or we use it seriously to describe the very finest Christian that we know. In the New Testament it is simply the name given to those who have 'been with Jesus'—ordinary men and women, who, with all their faults and follies, have made contact with the living Christ, and been united with Him.

How often Jesus speaks of the hidden, invisible powers of the Kingdom He proclaims. Salt—it gives the flavour, it preserves from corruption, but you don't see it. Leaven working hidden in the dough; light that reveals the beauty of the world but is never itself the object of our attention; the microscopic seed that sends through the dark damp earth the radiant power that breaks out in the foliage of Spring. When you pray, go away and close the door and talk to your Father in secret. Again and again we are warned that it is not the outward sign which makes a Christian. Jesus dismisses all such claims for public recognition with the devastating words: 'They have their reward'. What matters is the real bent and direction of our lives in that secret place known only to us and to the God 'unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid'. If then it can be said that we 'have been with Jesus', have listened to His claim, have bowed before His majesty, have been touched by His cross, have known something of the triumph of His love, then there is within us a saint in hiding, and it is not our business how or when he may be recognized.

It is even dangerous for us to think of him at all. The moment we become self-conscious about our Christian faith it begins to wither. Go looking for the saint in you—and he disappears. 'Let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith.' He will take care of that saint within.

The mark of a Christian, then, is our genuine devotion to our Lord in the hidden centre of our lives. But we shall be wrong if we imagine that this means that our faith can be hidden, that Christian influence is unmarked and unnoticed in our world.

In fact the real test of whether we have truly 'been with Jesus' is the whole-heartedness of our engagement in the world. 'Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works . . .' and say 'what a saint that person is'? No—'and glorify your Father which is in heaven'. This is the inevitable result of a true devotion to Christ.

What do we read about Peter and John in the presence of a hostile crowd? 'They took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus.' They recognized this one thing in them—not their power, their prestige, their appearance or their brain: simply that 'they had been with Jesus'. This is a recognition that we do not seek. It is not self-conscious; but it is inevitable. From the day when Jesus hung upon a cross, from the day when His first disciples told the world He had risen from the dead, men and women have recognized Him and those who have been with Him. They cannot help it. For there is no stronger power to charge a human life, to cleanse a nation, to deliver the world from evil, than this collective witness of the saints.

The Church of Jesus Christ is composed of those who, in one way or another, have 'been with Jesus'. That is how we are to be recognized, not by any outward badge, but by the compulsive infection of the saint in hiding. When we think of the work we go to do to-morrow, the conversations we shall have with friends, our comments on the issues of the day, our behaviour in our homes, we must in our worship be led to pray, without affectation or pretence:

> O that it might be said of me,
> Surely thy speech betrayeth thee;
> Thou wast with Jesus of Galilee.

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

What Think Ye Of Christ?

BY THE REVEREND ROBERT MENZIES, D.D., GLASGOW

'He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.'—Mt $16^{15f.}$

'Whom say ye that I am?' Jesus put this question to His disciples and it is clear that He was gravely concerned about the answer He was to receive. The measure of His concern may be gauged from three facts. Firstly, He carefully selected the spot where He put this question. Secondly, He spent all night in prayer before putting it. Thirdly, we can estimate its importance from the sense of relief He experienced when Peter, speaking for the other disciples, gave the right answer. Jesus was profoundly aware of the fact that this was a pivotal question. All His earthly ministry had been leading up to it. All that was likely to follow would be determined by the view men took of His Person. 'Whom say ye that I am?' Let me suggest three reasons why we should try to answer this question aright.

1. First of all, this question is important because it is easy *to give a false or imperfect answer.*

Jesus approached the personal question by asking His disciples the more general one, ' Whom do men say that I am ? ' What are people in the main saying about Me ? What is the man in the street thinking and saying about me ? Jesus attached importance to the verdict of the plain man. Our attitude generally is the reverse of this. It is only the verdict of the expert that we respect. Unlike us, Jesus generally distrusted the judgment of ' the wise and prudent '. In point of fact the verdict on Jesus of the intellectual and the accredited religious leaders was wholly false. The Sadducees said that He was a lunatic, the Pharisee that He was a bon-vivant, and the scribes that He was an ignoramus. On the other hand, the view of the man in the street though inadequate was not false. He placed Him, and rightly placed Him, amongst the greatest of the sons of Israel. The attitude toward Christ of the average man to-day as then is generally sounder than that of the purely intellectual or sophisticated. He is to him the highest, holiest manhood. He is the perfect bloom in the garden of life. This, however, hopeful though it be, is not enough. Our verdict on His Person is inadequate if we merely elevate Him to the highest rank amongst the sons of men. That this attitude is so usual is one of the reasons why we must face afresh the challenge of this question of our Lord.

2. Again this question is important *in view of the rival claimants to the throne of men's allegiance.* George Adam Smith in his *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* draws attention to the significance of the locality where this question was put. It was near the town of Cæsarea Philippi. Facing the disciples was a gleaming marble temple where Cæsar was worshipped as God. Cæsar worship was originally a political device, intended to bind together into a closer unity the far scattered portions of the Roman Empire. It became in later days a cruel tyranny, which led to the most violent persecution of the Christian faith. Cæsarism stands as the symbol of power-politics in every age. To-day this ancient heresy has come to life under different names—Hitlerism, Leninism, Communism, National Socialism. And there are tens of millions to-day who are dedicating themselves to this ancient yet new form of idolatry.

But Cæsar worship was not the only form of idolatry confronting the disciples at Cæsarea Philippi. Near the Temple was a grotto devoted to the worship of the Greek god Pan. Pan represented the delights of the senses. Pan is the spirit of the world and its devotees are as numerous as the sands on the sea shore.

There they stand, these two deities, putting in their rival claims, and over against them, challenging them both, stand the demands of the Christian faith. Can Christianity make good its claim to be a universal religion ? Can it stand up to power-politics or the spirit of the world, and say to them ' You have no claim to rule over the bodies and the souls of men—that is a right that belongs to Me alone ' ? If our religion presumes to make this all-in claim then we must know what kind of Person this Jesus is who makes this total demand. To accord to Him anything less than the place He demands, to say of Him that He is anything less than God, is to make absurd His right to supersede all rival claimants to the throne of man's allegiance.

3. Again this question is important because on our answer to it *depends our attitude to Christ's cross and our own.* You will notice that in this Gospel Jesus has nothing to say about His own sufferings or His disciples' till this question has been faced and answered. The moment, however, that Peter gives the right answer He proceeds forthwith to enlarge upon the sufferings that await Him at Jerusalem as well as His disciples' sufferings. What is the significance of this ?

What it means is that the view that one takes of Christ's cross will depend on the view one takes of His Person. If Jesus was only a man like ourselves, then His death has no more significance than that of any other dedicated man who has sealed his testimony with his blood. Jesus' death is merely one other shining instance amongst many others of complete devotion to a cause. But He is not the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. But if Jesus is God and not man, then His cross becomes the vicarious suffering of God Himself whose sacrifice avails for the sins of the world. His death is something quite different even from that of the most heroic martyr, an offering for sin that is unique, unshared, solitary.

This question has an important bearing also on the problem of human suffering. Some suffering is bound up with our Christian profession, what Paul calls ' the fellowship of His sufferings '. If we suffer for Christ's sake then the view we hold of His Person must qualify our attitude to such suffering. If Jesus is God then obviously it must be an inestimable privilege to suffer for the sake of His name, and must bind us close to His heart.

This same outlook holds good of all forms of suffering. All men are called upon to suffer, whether they are Christians or not. The way we stand up to the blitz of life depends largely on the view we hold of Christ. On one occasion Carlyle was passing through great tribulation. He was broken-hearted over the death of a relative. Some one reminded him of Christ's words—' In my Father's house are many mansions '. Carlyle's comment was : ' Ah, yes, these are wonderful words. If you were God you would have a right to say that. But if you are only a man you know no

more than I do. What you offer is merely a tentative surmise, a dim hope, a vague speculation. The rest is silence.' That is one of the reasons why our view of Christ is so important. If Christ is only a man like ourselves He can only help us by way of example. But if He is God, and is with us and in us as only God can be, then we shall not need to bear the burden of suffering unhelped. We shall have invisible means of support.

4. Finally, how is it possible for us to reach assurance regarding the Deity of Christ? It is something revealed to us by the Holy Spirit. 'Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.' We must reach the secret of the true nature of Christ's Person in the same way as the disciples did. They reached it by living constantly in Christ's presence, by listening to His voice, by seeking to do His will and following Him where He led. So doing, gradually and imperceptibly there will dawn on us, as in Peter's case, a full assurance regarding the Deity of Christ. We shall make his confession our own—'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God'.

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Finding His Self

BY THE LATE REVEREND H. H. SYMONDS,
THE LAKE DISTRICT

'Whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it'.—Mk 8^{35}.

This verse is thoroughly misleading in the Authorized Version. It implies that the way of using life most acceptable to God is to lose it: that martyrs are the most secure of salvation and that to die quietly in one's bed is only second best; it implies also that this life is of no great value in any case.

Now such is neither the experience of Jesus Himself nor His teaching. When He told us to pray to God 'thy kingdom come' He gave us the principles of living by which the Kingdom would be made possible, and these principles do *not* deny the value of living, they assume and assert it.

In the text 'whosoever will lose his life shall save it', the word 'life' is a quite possible translation of the corresponding word in the Greek, psyche, but the Greek itself is an incorrect translation from the original Aramaic, in which the Master spoke and thought, for we must remember that our Greek Testament is only a version (and not always an accurate version) of the original Good News or Gospel.

When our R.V. was made, seventy-eight years ago, the translators suggested the alternative translation which is possible for the Greek word psyche, 'soul'; for they felt that Jesus could not have invited men to general loss of life. But by 'soul' they made bad worse. 'He that loseth his soul for my sake shall find it.' How can any man so lose his soul as to serve God better? Though the other half of the verse does make better sense than in the A.V.—'he who would save his soul shall lose it'. Here we have a warning against that careful anxiety for one's own salvation which people have miscalled 'religion'.

The difficulty is to be solved as it is in another of the sayings of Jesus. There was a complacent rich man who had full barns, and he determined to enjoy them. 'He will say to his soul' (so we read) 'Soul you have many good things laid up in store: take your ease, eat, drink and be merry'. Now an Englishman talking aloud would certainly address neither his soul nor his life but himself. 'Well, now', he might say to himself (if he had this habit of speech), 'you have had plenty of effort my good So-and-So' (here he might put in his own name, whatever it was), 'you can now enjoy yourself'. And so exactly a Jew would have said; but he had this difficulty (and here is the root of the matter) that his Aramaic speech did not say 'self', 'yourself', 'himself', and so forth; for self in these reflexive pronouns it would say 'life'. And that is why the rich man speaks to his 'life' (or to his soul).

We have now the explanation of the famous saying about losing life to save it. The correct translation is this: 'He who would save himself shall lose himself: *but he who will lose himself shall save himself*'.

This is God's grand surprise, always scattering the cautious hearts. What does it mean? Who is it who would always be saving himself? This is the sheltered life so carefully balanced on its two equal feet, so fore-thoughtful, so futile; and all this kind of living, said the Lord, is nothing. And who is it who loses himself? This is the aspiring life, so careless of itself and so fondly loyal to an ideal, so little insured against the chances of to-morrow, so passionate, so useful; and this, says the Lord, is everything, the stuff from which all Christian conduct is made. He who *loses* himself in some great service, forgets himself. He who bargains and balances and always asks what others say of him, who always sees himself only as reflected in others' minds —this man is dead, he has no self at all; anxious to save himself, that little nervous thing that he has called a self, he has grown cramped and narrow, restrained and orderly perhaps, but dead.

We speak of the Christian duty of self-sacrifice but it is never the true self which is to be sacrificed or given up. The true self, enthusiastic in serving God, forgets and forgoes pleasure or comfort or convenience; but it does this because it loves the service best, loves God more than it loves things indifferent by comparison and *not* because it distrusts pleasure or thinks life's good things to be bad or happiness to be displeasing to God.

No one has any right at all to sacrifice his self—that is to warp and mutilate those powers of action and of thought and feeling which make him an effective and a happy personality. Jesus was not an ascetic and never preached asceticism, never, that is, believed or taught that to deny ourselves simply in order to deny ourselves was a good or a helpful or a godlike thing to do. We may imagine that He did not believe in using up vital energy like that. For Him life rested not on fear but on love, not on repression but on freedom and creation, on a positive ideal naturally attractive not on a negative and artificial self-chastisement. The doctrine that a carefully constructed system of discomforts was pleasing to God, as when the Pharisees set a limit to the mileage of Sunday walks – all this He swept clean away. He liked to see man serve his God in the fresh air of common sense. For 'the strongest man in the world', says a character in one of Ibsen's plays, 'is he who stands most alone'. And sometimes we must stand alone. But we must not *come to like doing it.* Our business is to convert the world, by a gracious and attractive temper; not to expose ourselves as a pillar of solitary strength. For it is quite easy and possible to persuade ourselves that our best service to God is done in a minority of one, and to console ourselves for a loneliness which we really like by some fantastic anticipation of the whole world coming to our feet. But that is really self-interest in us, interest in our own success, and self-deception; to stand alone may be a necessity: we may be right in so standing, but the necessity is always an evil and we cannot take any pride in it without treason to our Christian service. For if a man loses himself in the service of God, forgets himself and all his personal success or status and cares for the cause and not for self—then he finds God and he also finds his fellow-men, he has no personal pride because to find God *is* to love and serve men. Care for them, the eager hope to make God's cause acceptable to all of them, the absence of all bitterness and pride (and of all pleasure in isolation), these are the parts of the knowledge and service of God, without them we do not know God and do not serve Him, without them we have not lost our *self*, we have found our self, for no man finds his self till he has found God, and if he finds God he finds man also. So let us prepare to face all hardship, misfortune, loss. The issue at stake is the survival of Christian life, of civilized thought. Let no man deny that the issue is worth while; it calls in each of us for a self which will merge itself in a great cause and, at any cost to itself, bring the cause to triumph.

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Begrudging God's Generosity

BY THE REVEREND OWEN E. EVANS, M.A., B.D., MANCHESTER

'Friend, I am doing you no wrong; did you not agree with me for a denarius? Take what belongs to you, and go; I choose to give to this last as I give to you. Am I not allowed to do what I choose with what belongs to me? Or do you begrudge my generosity?' —Mt 20^{13-15} (R.S.V.).

The clue to the understanding of this perplexing parable, as J. Jeremias has clearly shown us, lies in the recognition that as originally told by Jesus it was directed, not towards His disciples (as the context in Matthew suggests) but towards His Pharisaic opponents, and that the saying of *v.* 16 was originally no part of the parable. When the parable is so regarded its climax and point occur in the words addressed by the householder to the spokesman of the complaining workmen, and it is brought into the same class as the parables addressed to the Pharisees in Lk 15.

From a human point of view it is not difficult to feel considerable sympathy for these workmen who had 'borne the burden of the day and the scorching heat'. In the words of the late T. W. Manson, 'the policy of the householder is neither strict justice nor sound economics'. But as Manson was quick to add 'to this it can only be replied that it is fortunate for most of us that God does not deal with us on the basis of strict justice and sound economics'. Whether Jesus, had He been minded to deliver a lesson to employers on economics and industrial policy, would have recommended exactly the method of payment which He attributes to the householder in the parable may be a question for interesting speculation, but it is not the point here. In the parable Jesus is concerned not with an economic but with a religious question, not with the way human employers *ought* to act but with the way God *does* act in His relationships with men. And God's thoughts are not our thoughts, neither are our ways His ways.

We may ask, then, what the parable has to teach us about God's way of rewarding those who

respond to His call to enlist in His service and labour in His vineyard.

1. First, the parable teaches that *the reward is the same for all* who so respond. It does not vary in proportion to the amount and value of the service rendered. It is doubtless true that the merit of some of God's servants exceeds that of others, by virtue of the fact that they have rendered longer and more worthy service. But God's reward is not according to merit but according to grace. Moreover, the nature of the reward in question is such that it cannot be divided up into portions of varying size and value. A monetary reward can be so divided ; the householder in the parable, had he so wished, could have paid the various groups of labourers on the basis of one-twelfth, one-quarter, one-half, three-quarters, or a full denarius as the case might be, and none could have considered himself wronged. But God's reward to His servants consists in making them the objects, in a special way, of His love and the heirs of His Kingdom ; they are welcomed into the full privileges and blessings of children in the Heavenly Father's family. And such a reward, by its very nature, cannot be divided into fractions. To quote Manson again, ' there is no such thing as a twelfth part of the love of God ' ; and the same is true of the privileges and blessings of life in a true family. Thus the reward of God is one that must be received in full or not at all. It is not by measure that God bestows His love. The reward accordingly is the same for all, irrespective of the merits or otherwise of any.

2. Secondly, *no one who has received this reward can ever have any ground for complaint against God.* He can never claim to have been ' hard done by '. ' Friend, I am doing you no wrong ; did you not agree with me for a denarius ? Take what belongs to you, and go.' Granted that these ' full-timers ' had thoroughly earned their day's wages in full (and let it be said in their favour that the parable nowhere suggests that they had not), even so they had no ground for complaint, for none of them could claim to have earned more than a denarius, which was the ' agreed rate ' for a day's labouring and was regarded as an entirely fair wage (indeed they had been glad enough to accept the terms at the time of their engagement). Likewise the servant of God, even if he could claim to have deserved the reward which God offers to him, would have no cause for complaint. But what servant of God, whatever the length and loyalty and outstanding worth of the service he may have rendered, could ever dare to make such a claim ? He knows only too well that his reward is not due in the slightest degree to any merit of his own but solely to God's abundant grace, and that the only possible reaction on his part must be one of humble and wondering gratitude. The very thought that a man who has received entrance by God's grace into His Kingdom should complain of unjust treatment at God's hand is ludicrous and blasphemous.

3. Finally, it follows that *it becomes no one who is himself the recipient of God's reward to complain if God sees fit to bestow the same reward upon others*, whom He may consider to be less worthy than himself. The Kingdom belongs to God, and so to Him belongs also the right to determine who may enter it. If the reward is the gift of God's grace, then God must be at liberty to assign it as He wills. ' Am I not allowed to do what I choose with what belongs to me ? ' If God chooses to accept the vilest offender and the unworthiest sinner, who are we to forbid Him ? To seek to do so is (in the excellent phrase in which the Revised Standard Version renders the metaphor of ' the evil eye ') to begrudge His generosity. Begrudge God's generosity, indeed ! Where would any of us be were God not so limitlessly generous and gracious ? The man who has himself benefitted by this Divine generosity and who recognizes his own inestimable debt thereto can surely never begrudge the fact that God so deals with men. At every fresh demonstration that he witnesses of the Divine grace in action in the lives of others, he will surely be moved, not to petulant envy but to grateful joy.

The attitude of the grumblers in this parable is essentially the same attitude as that of the elder son in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, who was angry because his less worthy brother had been welcomed back with such rejoicing into the privileges of the home which he himself had never ceased to enjoy. It is the attitude of Jonah (who has been aptly called ' the Elder Son of the Old Testament '), complaining because God had mercy on sinful Nineveh. It was the attitude of the worst of the Pharisees of Jesus' day, who, conscious that they were saved themselves, complained because Jesus offered salvation to the publicans and sinners whom they despised. And it is the attitude of those in every age who, in their proud self-righteousness, seek to make a kind of ' closed shop ' of the Kingdom of God and to keep out all who do not measure up to their standards—to keep them out, moreover, even when God Himself is willing to receive them. We must always be on our guard against such effrontery, and recognize that the surest way of shutting ourselves out of the Kingdom of God is by seeking to shut others out, and the surest way of securing and learning to enjoy the blessings of the Kingdom is by doing all in our power to share them with others, desiring only that ' the arms of love that compass me ' should ' all mankind embrace '.

Great Themes of the New Testament

VI. Matthew xxiv. (*continued*)

By the Reverend William Barclay, D.D., The University of Glasgow

5. It is when we come to the fifth strand of material in this passage that we come to the material which gives to it its peculiar and special interest and importance, for the fifth strand is the strand which contains the material concerning the Parousia, the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. We shall first of all set down what the passage has to say about the Parousia.

(1) The Parousia is to be sudden, magnificent and terrifying, at least to the enemies of Christ (Mt $24^{27.\ 30}$, Mk 13^{26}, Lk 17^{24} 21^{27}). It will be like the lightning flash, and it will be in power, in splendour and in glory.

(2) It will be a shattering inbreak of God upon the thoughtless (Mt 24^{37-39}, Lk 17^{27-30}). Just as the Flood came upon men and women who were unconcernedly going about the tasks and the pleasures of life, and suddenly involved them in disaster, so the Parousia will confront with eternity those who are never lifting their eyes beyond time.

(3) It will be a time of separation (Mt $24^{40.\ 41}$, Lk $17^{34.\ 35}$). One will be taken and the other will be left. The choice of God will be exercised upon men.

(4) The time of its coming is utterly unknown, except only to God (Mt 24^{36}, Mk 13^{32}). Not the angels, not even the Son, still less any man, can know the time of the decisive action of God.

Since all this is the case, certain things necessarily follow.

(a) The first consequence is not one which this passage actually sets down, but it is a consequence which must be obvious. Speculation as to the time of the Parousia is not only futile, it is actually blasphemous, for a knowledge which is not given even to the Son to possess surely cannot be a knowledge which the mind of man may covet. What is not given to Jesus Christ to know is very certainly not given to men to know.

(b) The remaining three consequences are set down in this passage. There is the demand for *endurance* (Mt 24^{13}, Mk 13^{13}, Lk 21^{19}). It is he who endures to the end who will be saved. The verb which is used for to endure is *ὑπομένειν*, and the noun which is used for *patience* or *endurance* is *ὑπομονή*. About these words there is a certain untranslatable quality. They do not describe the attitude of the man who resignedly sits down with bowed head and folded hands and passively allows the flood-tide of disaster and trial to flow over him with a dull submissiveness. They describe what has been called 'a masculine constancy under trial'. There is gallantry in them; they describe the spirit which can transmute suffering into glory. The endurance in question is not mere acceptance; it is the endurance which can use even the terrible experiences of life as a means of strengthening, deepening and refining character, and as a means of coming ever nearer and closer to God.

(c) There is the demand for *wisdom in reading the signs of the times* (Mt $24^{32.\ 33}$, Mk 13^{28-39}, Lk 21^{29-31}). The curious feature of the coming of the end both in Jewish and in early Christian thought was the belief that the coming of the end would be sudden and unpredictable, but that at the same time there would be unmistakable signs that it was certainly on the way. The tragedy of life is that men can read the signs of Nature but are blind to the signs of God.

(d) There is the demand for constant *watchfulness* (Mt 24^{42-51}, Mk 13^{32-37}, Lk 21^{34-36} 12^{35-48}). The Christian must be like a servant at all time ready for his master's coming. He must never be like the servant who uses his master's absence to follow out his own nefarious purposes, and is then caught unawares by his master's home-coming. The key-note of the faith of the early Christians was the word 'Watch'.

Up to this point the material of this chapter is straightforward enough; we could say that we have a clear enough picture of the Parousia, in so far as any picture of such an event can be clear; but now into this picture there comes the one piece, which, as it were, does not fit. As clearly as it can be said, it is said that all these events are to take place within the lifetime of the generation which heard these words spoken. 'This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled' (Mt 24^{34}, Mk 13^{30}, Lk 21^{32}). We must clearly examine the teaching of this whole passage on the Second Coming in the light of this saying.

It is significant that this sentence confronts us with a difficulty which is always emerging, when we examine the teaching of the Gospels on the Second Coming. We find this difficulty very early in the Gospel narrative in Matthew's version of events. In Matthew's story, when Jesus despatched the apostles on their first mission, He

said: 'Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come' (Mt 10^{23}). If Jesus said that, we are plainly confronted with two possibilities—either, He was wrong, or, the saying must be interpreted in some other way than at its literal and face value.

We may well find our key to this difficulty by comparing the different versions of the one saying which are contained in the three Gospels. In Mt 16^{28} Jesus is represented as saying: 'Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom'. In Mk 9^{1} the same saying appears as: 'Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power'. In Lk 9^{27} the same saying appears as: 'But I tell you of a truth, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God'. Here is a case in which we have to make a choice between different versions of the same saying. It is frequently possible in the gospel narrative to explain different versions of the same saying by assuming that Jesus used the same saying on different occasions, as any preacher might and does, and used it in varying forms. But here the occasion is the same occasion. When we examine these three versions of this saying of Jesus, the conclusion is, that if Matthew's version is the correct one, then Jesus' prediction was not fulfilled, and that He was mistaken. But if the version of Mark and Luke is correct, the saying was abundantly fulfilled, because the Kingdom did indeed come with power within the lifetime of many who heard it, for in one generation the message and the power of the gospel did go out from Jerusalem to Samaria, to Judæa and to the uttermost parts of the earth, and the Kingdom did come with power upon men. We may well hold here that a saying which originally spoke of the coming of the Kingdom was personalized into a saying which spoke of the coming of Jesus Christ.

This is part of a larger phenomenon which manifests itself in the Gospels. In the Gospels it is strangely true that there are sayings which seem to be on the face of it foundational evidence for the doctrine of the Second Coming, and which on closer examination will not support the structure of doctrine which has been erected upon them.

The most notable of such sayings is the saying of Jesus at His trial before the High Priest. There are three versions of Jesus' answer to the demand of the High Priest for an answer to the question whether or not He was the Christ, the Son of God. In each case Jesus accepted that claim. In Mt 26^{64} He is represented as going on to say: 'Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven'. In Mk 14^{62} the same saying runs, 'Ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven'. In Lk 22^{69} the saying becomes: 'Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God'. It is clear that, whatever we may conclude in regard to the versions of Matthew and Mark, Luke's version has no reference to the Second Coming whatsoever. It has long since been noted that this saying goes back to a passage in Dn $7^{13.14}$. In that passage one like unto a son of man comes with the clouds of heaven into the presence of the ancient of days, and there is given to him a dominion, a glory and a kingdom, which are universal and eternal. That is to say, the original passage describes, not an arrival on earth, but an arrival in heaven. The entire probability, therefore, is that Jesus was not in this passage foretelling His Second Coming, but He was saying: 'At the moment you look on Me as a criminal in your power, to do with as you will, to send to a Cross. But the day will come when you will see Me throned in glory with God.' The exact parallel to this passage will then be Ph 2^{9-11} where it is said that because of Jesus' complete obedience God has highly exalted Him and has given Him a name at which every creature in all the universe will bow in submission. It is a foretelling, not of His return to earth, but of His enthronement in the glory of the heavenly places.

Can we, then, in view of this passage, and in view of the general teaching in the Gospels, come to any general conclusions about the meaning of the Parousia of Jesus Christ? It seems that there are four possible lines of approach.

(1) We may regard the Parousia of Jesus Christ as one definite event which will take place at some unknown time in the future. We may look for the Second Coming of Jesus Christ as an event in history, even if it is the event to end history. Lines of argument to support this view are not lacking. It may be said that, so far as there is an orthodox view of the Second Coming, this is the orthodox view. It well fits in with the whole Biblical view of history. It would be the New Testament counterpart, or rather the New Testament fulfilment, of the Old Testament picture of the Day of the Lord. In the historical Second Coming of Jesus Christ the Old Testament expectation of the Day of the Lord would find its true consummation and completion. It might be well said that the historical Second Coming of Jesus Christ is the essential corollary of His Resurrection and His Ascension and Exaltation. The Resurrection vindicated every claim of Jesus Christ, and the Second Coming would be the universal demonstration of the universal and

eternal lordship of Jesus Christ. An historical Second Coming would conserve the great Christian and Biblical truth that history is going somewhere towards a goal, that there is a plan and a purpose in events, that history is not circular and repetitive, not pointless and purposeless, not on the way to slow extinction, but that it has a consummation in the mind of God. It is further to be said that there is little doubt that in the thought of the Early Church the Second Coming was to be an historical event involving the Christians and all mankind. The arguments for the Second Coming as a future, definite event are strong; but nonetheless it remains true that the evidence for this kind of Second Coming is not nearly so strong in the Gospels as at first sight it appears, and it may well be that we shall have to seek some other line of approach.

(2) It is possible to argue that the Second Coming of Jesus Christ has happened in the coming of the Holy Spirit. To all intents and purposes this would mean that the events of Pentecost constitute the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. There is at least something of this conception in the thought of the Fourth Gospel. 'I will not leave you comfortless', says the Christ of the Fourth Gospel, 'I will come to you' (Jn 14^{18}), and that coming was definitely in the coming of the Holy Spirit. 'If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him' (Jn 14^{23}). There is no doubt that the Fourth Gospel does see the coming of the Spirit as the coming of Jesus Christ into a man's life. This would be in the most literal sense to spiritualize the whole idea of the Second Coming. Jesus Christ would then be the Person who came once in the flesh, and who came again in the Holy Spirit, and who continues so to come.

(3) It is possible to approach the whole conception of the Second Coming along the lines of what is known as realized eschatology. To do that is to say that the whole process of eschatological events has already been realized in Jesus Christ. In Him the victory over all evil has finally been won; the powers of darkness and the spirits of evil have finally been defeated. In Him the Kingdom has been fully realized and did fully come.

There is a sense in which this is emphatically true. In the life and death of Jesus Christ something did happen to break the power of sin. The Lord's Prayer sets two petitions side by side —'Thy kingdom come', and 'Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven'. If we apply the ordinary principles of Hebrew parallelism to these two phrases we may say that the Kingdom of heaven is a society in which God's will is as perfectly done on earth as it is in heaven. And, if that is so, then the Kingdom was fully and finally realized in Jesus Christ, because in Him and by Him God's will was perfectly done. On this view the Second Coming is no longer a necessary event, because the whole eschatological process and ideal has found its consummation and realization and completion in Jesus Christ.

This idea found its most epigrammatic and succinct expression in the famous dictum that D-day is now past, and V-day must of necessity follow.

Stated, as it were, in theory there is great attraction in that way of putting things. But one cannot evade the feeling that it does not fit the facts. In point of fact the forces of evil are not subdued, and in point of fact human nature is not changed, and in point of fact sin is not defeated.

The D-day, V-day analogy suffers from one basic defect; the fact is that the process of salvation, God's offer of salvation, the way in which a man is saved, cannot properly be likened to a campaign. When a war has been waged, and when victory has been won, every member of the victorious nation shares in that victory, whether he likes it or not. The nation as a whole is released from danger; the nation as a whole is no longer threatened; the nation as a whole enjoys the benefits of that victory. A man cannot even opt out of that victory; he is a member of a victorious nation. Now the whole point of the benefits of salvation in Christ is that they have to be appropriated. Assuredly man can neither merit them nor achieve them, but he must appropriate them. A much closer analogy is the discovery of some cure whereby a fatal illness can be cured and overcome. Even if there be such a cure, the person suffering from that illness can find no cure until he accepts the cure and submits to the treatment and appropriates the benefits which are now available for him. Christ's victory is a victory which has to be appropriated. We, therefore, suggest that there is still another way in which to approach this whole matter of the Parousia, the Second Coming, of Jesus Christ.

(4) There is the way which, we suggest, may be described by the phrase *personalized eschatology*. It is possible to think of the whole eschatological process, and, in particular, of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ, as happening within the individual heart and soul.

The coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh was an event in history. But it is an event which is different from any other event which ever happened in history. It makes no difference to a man's present life in this world or to his eternal welfare in any other world, if he never thinks of, or if he totally disregards, the historical event of the

Battle of Hastings. It does not essentially affect him, even if he is quite unaware that that battle was ever fought. No one would ever dream of sending missionaries to the ends of the earth to tell men that William of Normandy landed in Sussex in England in the year 1066. But we do seek to bring the news to all mankind that Jesus Christ was born into Palestine. We do so because we believe that the coming into the world of Jesus Christ was an event which has its direct value for every man.

Now, if a man is unaware of the coming of Christ, he has to be told of it. If he disregards it, he has to be brought to see its supreme importance. And, therefore, it is literally true to say that Jesus Christ has to come again into every individual life. The shattering change, the inbreak of God, the inexplicable arrival of Jesus Christ, the whole eschatological process has to take place within the individual human heart and soul, till Christ comes again into the life of every man, and until eschatology so becomes personalized.

The Parousia of Christ, His Second Coming, is not a subject on which anyone would wish, or indeed has any right, to dogmatize. But it may well be that the whole picture of it in Scripture is a vivid, dramatic, symbolic representation of a process which must take place within the individual human heart, so that the whole eschatological process, and the Second Coming of Christ, become personalized in each man's being.

Thy Will be Done in Earth, as it is in Heaven (Matthew vi. 11)

A Suggested Re-interpretation

By the Reverend G. H. P. Thompson. Vice-Principal The Theological College, Salisbury, Wilts.

The first half of the Lord's Prayer in St. Matthew's Gospel consists of three petitions, each of which is concerned with the achievement of the purpose of God. The final petition reads in the Greek according to the firmly established text: *γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς.* The true text of Lk 11[2] does not contain this petition.

On the normal explanation, the prayer is that God's will may be done or become effective on earth, as that will is already effective and operative in heaven. As usually interpreted, this means that God's purpose is already being carried out in heaven, where the angels do His perfect service, and that perfect harmony of heaven is to be reproduced on earth. Such an exegesis is theologically sound provided that the translation of the Greek underlying this interpretation is admissible. The object of this article is to show very tentatively that the normal translation of these words involves a strain on the Greek Text, and that there is a possible alternative translation, which is easier and more natural, and which also makes sense theologically and has a link with other parts of New Testament thought.

We first of all consider the difficulties of the normal translation.

(1) It is necessary to understand with *ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ* some such phrase as *τὸ θέλημά σου ἤδη γίνεται*—*γίνεται* being understood from the Imperative *γενηθήτω*. This in itself is not impossible, as there are instances in the New Testament, where the verb has to be understood with *ὡς* acting as a conjunction, though very often the verb is given, even at the risk of repeating the same verb that has been used in the main clause of the sentence. But where such a verb has to be understood, in these cases the supplying of the verb is natural and easy.

For example: Mt 13[43] *οἱ δίκαιοι ἐκλάμψουσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος* (*ἐκλάμπει* understood).

Lk 12[27]: *οὐδὲ Σολομὼν. . . . περιεβάλετο ὡς ἓν τούτων* (*περιβάλλεται* understood).

Mt 10[16] *γίνεσθε . . . φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις* (*γίνονται* understood).

But in the present instance the subject of the comparison clause and the verb have to be understood and supplied in a way that is unnatural and forced.

(2) As usually interpreted, the *ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ* clause together with the words to be supplied consists of a clause expressing comparison with *ὡς* used as a conjunction; the *καὶ* before *ἐπὶ γῆς* is translated 'also'. *ὡς* is often used in this way to introduce a clause of comparison correlative with the main verb. But in the present instance this clause is fitted into the main sentence and separates the main verb (here *γενηθήτω*—an imperative)

from its indirect object (*καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς*). Such a construction is to say the least very unusual. Even if the construction as criticised under (1) were possible, it would be more natural for *ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ* to stand after *ἐπὶ γῆς* as follows: *γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ*. Even then it is not easy to understand an Indicative with *ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ* from the Imperative *γενηθήτω*. And I would suggest that it is very difficult to find a parallel example where a *ὡς* clause at one and the same time stands in the middle of the main sentence and also has to have a verb and subject supplied.

(3) The first two objections were of a negative kind. We now come to an objection of a more positive kind. We have seen that the normal explanation treats *ὡς* as a conjunction with a subject and verb understood and takes the *καί* in the sense of 'also'. But this is to ignore the construction *ὡς . . . καί* which, as the equivalent of *ὡς . . . οὕτως*, occurs elsewhere in the New Testament and in other literature, and has the effect of linking together clauses that are similar and parallel to each other, such as *ἐν οὐρανῷ* and *ἐπὶ γῆς* in the present passage. This construction needs to be considered in more detail in relation to its usage in other parts of the New Testament.

The usage of *ὡς . . . καί* in the New Testament.

(a) Joining two parallel verbs together. Gal. 1^{9} *ὡς προειρήκαμεν, καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω*. 'As we have said before, so I say again now'. Ac 7^{51} *ὡς πατέρες ὑμῶν, καὶ ὑμεῖς*. 'As your fathers were, so are you'.

In the last instance the verbs are understood quite easily.

(b) Joining two parallel participles together. 2 Cor 13^{2} *προείρηκα καὶ προλέγω, ὡς παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον, καὶ ἀπὼν νῦν*. . . . 'I said in advance and I say in advance, as being present the second time, so being absent now . . . that if I come again, I will not spare'.

Paul had said in advance and again he says in advance that he will not spare the Corinthians, if he comes again to Corinth. He refers to these two occasions in the *ὡς . . . καί* clause. The first threat was made at the time of his second visit to Corinth; the second time is made at the time of writing, when he is absent. Here two clauses parallel to each other are joined together by *ὡς . . . καί* and the effect seems to be 'exactly the same when present as when now absent'—'whether . . . or'—'both . . . and'—'on the one hand . . . on the other'.

(c) Joining two adverbs of time together. Ph 1^{20} . . . *κατὰ τὴν ἀποκαραδοκίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα μου ὅτι ἐν οὐδενὶ αἰσχυνθήσομαι ἀλλ' ἐν πάσῃ παρρησίᾳ ὡς πάντοτε καὶ νῦν μεγαλυνθήσεται Χριστός*'. . . according to my expectation and hope that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but that without hindrance Christ shall be magnified as at all times so now. . . .'

Paul's hope is that he will not be ashamed or disappointed in anything, but that Christ will be magnified or glorified in his (Paul's) person, *ὡς πάντοτε καὶ νῦν*, whether through the death of Paul or through his continued life on earth. The reference here is to the future, and the natural way of translating *ὡς πάντοτε καὶ νῦν* is 'that Christ shall be magnified at all times (in the future) and especially now', 'especially at the present juncture and crisis'. It would not be justified to translate 'as at all times in the past'. Such an exegesis would involve a strain on the Greek sentence and also presumption on the part of Paul! Paul in this section of the Epistle to the Philippians is looking entirely to the future and hopes that whatever the outcome of the present troubles the future will always and particularly *now* be for the glory of Christ. Here too *ὡς . . . καί* joins together two phrases parallel to each other. Here again the translation 'both . . . and' or 'both . . . and in particular'. This latter passage is very similar to the one under discussion.

From this discussion of the construction *ὡς . . . καὶ* two points emerge.

(a) *ὡς . . . καί* is used to join together clauses that are perfectly parallel to each other. On the usual interpretation of this part of the Lord's Prayer, the *ὡς* and *καί* clauses are not parallel to each other, and so the usage here would not conform to the usage of the rest of the New Testament. According to the latter usage, *ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ* must go closely with *καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς* and not with the verb.

(b) *ὡς . . . καί* sometimes has the meaning of 'both . . . and' or 'on the one hand . . . on the other'. For this we may compare the Latin construction *ut . . . sic* or *ut . . . ita* which can also mean 'both . . . and'. This may be the meaning in the passage under consideration. The prayer would then be 'Let God's will be done both in heaven and on earth—as certainly in the one as in the other'. It is a prayer that God's purpose may be achieved in the heavenly and the earthly spheres alike. Whether this is plausible theology or not, we consider later.

In support of this suggested translation two other factors may be urged.

(a) Let us suppose that the clause in question were in the Indicative instead of in the Imperative. Then it would run as follows: *γίνεται τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς*. There would be no hesitation in translating this as: 'Thy will is done both in heaven and on earth'. When therefore we substitute the Imperative for the Indicative the same translation of *ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς* should apply.

(b) If this suggested translation is at all possible, then it would also follow that the phrase *ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς* could be taken with all three petitions of the first half of the Lord's Prayer. It is a prayer that God's honour may be upheld and asserted (*ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου*), that His Kingdom may come (*ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου*), that His will may become operative (*γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημα σου*)—and all this in relation to heaven and earth. You have three petitions all exactly parallel to one another, and then the concluding clause going with all three. On the normal explanation, the phrase *ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς* could only go with the last of the three petitions. On the reinterpretation the following neat arrangement results :

ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου
ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου
γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου
ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς.

The perfect parallelism that results may be in favour of the suggested translation, especially when we consider the perfect arrangement and parallelism that marks so many of our Lord's sayings.

If the translation outlined above is correct, what is the theological meaning of this opening section of the Lord's Prayer ? In what sense do we pray that God's name may be hallowed, that His Kingdom may come and that His will may be done both *in heaven* and on earth ? Does such a prayer make sense in the light of the New Testament teaching as a whole ?

We must first of all consider quite briefly the term *οὐρανός*. This term used either in the singular or the plural is employed by the New Testament writers in a theological sense to denote the unseen world—the supra-mundane world, that is to say the world of God and of the angelic beings, good and evil. There is a frequent contrast between the heavenly sphere and the earthly sphere. To the heavenly realm of existence belong the *ἐξουσίαι, ἀρχαί, κυριότητες, θρόνοι*—cf. Col 1^{16} and note that in this passage *τὰ ἀορατα* (the unseen world) and *τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* (the heavens) are parallel to one another. It is moreover inherent in New Testament thought that there is conflict in the heavenly sphere, as there is in the earthly. Corresponding to man's rebellion on earth, there is the rebellion of the angelic forces in heaven, and the beings referred to in Col 1^{16} are usually thought of in the New Testament as angelic beings who have usurped God's power in the universe or *κόσμος*, and through whose activity the universe is in the grip of evil. Looked at from one aspect, the work of Christ is seen as a decisive victory over these powers (cf. Col 2^{15}), though the final victory of Christ lies in the future at His Parousia (cf. 1 Cor 15^{24}). This idea of conflict is also reflected in Colossians and Ephesians where the work of Christ is concerned with the reconciliation of all things to God *εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* (Col 1^{20}) or with the summing up of all things *τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπι τῆς γῆς* (Eph. 1^{10}). In both cases, *τὰ πάντα* (the all) including the beings of the unseen world as well as the visible creation are to be reconciled to God in Christ, and this movement of reconciliation has already begun through the ministry, death and resurrection of Christ ; the need for reconciliation in the heavenly sphere reveals that there, too, there has been rebellion against God (cf. also Eph. $6^{12ff.}$ and the vivid language of Rev 12^{7}). We also recall that Christ's earthly work as described in the Gospels is set against a background of conflict with Satan and the other unseen forces of evil. God's will and kingship have to be asserted both in the heavenly and the earthly sphere. Therefore we pray that this may be so—that God may reign both in heaven and on earth. But we pray this knowing that D-Day is past and that V-Day will surely come (cf. Cullmann, *Christ and Time*).

These two elements, the inaugurated and the futuristic eschatology, are seen in clear relation to each other when we link the present passage under discussion with another passage which is also peculiar to St. Matthew's Gospel and which also contains the combination *ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς*. In Mt 28^{18} the Risen Christ says *ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς*. Jesus is now the Exalted Son of Man. He has won a decisive victory over sin and death and the evil powers, and so He has inaugurated God's Kingdom, and all authority and power is His to consummate God's reign and Kingdom both in heaven and earth. (The very fact that ' heaven ' is mentioned here side by side with ' earth ' suggests that in the heavenly sphere, too, Christ's power is to be exercised to bring in God's Kingdom.) St. Matthew perhaps intended us to see a connexion between the opening part of the Lord's Prayer ($6^{10ff.}$) and these words of the Risen Christ (28^{18}). As commanded, we pray that God's Kingdom may come and that God's will may be done both in heaven and earth, but we pray this, knowing that the Exalted Son of Man, the Lord of our belief, has already asserted God's kingship both in the heavenly and the earthly spheres. We pray that V-Day may come, in the sure and certain knowledge that D-Day is past. We pray that God's reign may be established, but as we pray this, we know that God's final word in this universe lies with Christ, who through His completed work has full and plenipotentiary power to unfold the book of destiny and release God's final purpose.

Recent Foreign Theology

Dutch Catholic Old Testament Commentary. The volumes of the commentary on the Old Testament, published by Dutch Roman Catholics under the editorship of A. van der Born, W. Grossouw, and J. van der Ploeg, have been noted in these columns as they have appeared. Three further volumes have now been published, in which J. de Fraine deals with *Judges and Ruth*,[1] A. Drubbel deals with *Wisdom*,[2] and B. N. Wambacq deals with *Jeremiah, Lamentations, Baruch, and the Epistle of Jeremy*.[3] As in all the volumes of this series the Introductions are short, but a good commentary stands beneath a newly translated text. These translations are made from the Hebrew—or in the case of Wisdom from the Greek—and not from the Vulgate, as in Mgr. Knox's recent translation into English.

On textual matters the authors show a balanced judgment, and avoid on the one hand the extremes of emendation which formerly filled the commentaries, and on the other the rigid acceptance of the traditional text which some advocate. They adopt quite a number of emendations—and in some volumes these are listed at the end of the commentary—though generally showing a wisely cautious spirit. On higher critical questions their approach is enlightened, while again being cautious. De Fraine tells his readers in brief the large variety of views which have been advanced on the composition of the Book of Judges, though he says less than they might desire as to which is to be adopted and why. Drubbel refrains from any attempt to identify the author of Wisdom, though he records amongst other suggestions the very improbable idea that it might be from the pen of Onias III. On the canonicity of the book he notes the early Fathers who rejected its inspiration, as well as the many writers who regarded it as canonical, down to the time when the Council of Trent affirmed its inspiration and canonicity.

Wambacq follows a number of recent writers in rejecting the view that the early prophecies of Jeremiah had as their background the Scythian peril—a view which is familiar to the many English readers of John Skinner's great book, *Prophecy and Religion*. He also rejects the view that Jeremiah was irrevocably opposed to all sacrifice. Here once more he parts company with Skinner—rightly in the reviewer's opinion.

The authors of these volumes show a good acquaintance with both Protestant and Catholic work on the Old Testament, and their commentaries will be consulted with profit by readers at all levels. Occasionally there are omissions. Thus Wambacq, who shows his knowledge of D. J. Wiseman's *Chronicles of the Chaldæan Kings* and other recent literature, discusses the question of Jehoiachin's children purely in terms of the Biblical references. It is well known that whereas Jeremiah says 'Write ye this man childless,' elsewhere we have reference to his children, and he figures in the genealogy of Mt 1 as an ancestor of our Lord. In 1939 Weidner published some Babylonian tablets which put the matter beyond dispute, since they record the rations allowed to the captive king and his children by the Babylonian authorities.

The Scrolls and the Synoptic Gospels. H. Braun, who had earlier written articles on the Dead Sea Scrolls, has now devoted a full-scale study in two volumes to the comparison between the Scrolls and the Synoptic Gospels.[4] In the first volume he examines the Mishnah tractate Pirqe Aboth, which is treated as the standard of Jewish orthodoxy, and then the Manual of Discipline, the Habakkuk Commentary, the information about the Essenes contained in the first-century writers Philo and Josephus, and the Zadokite Work. In the second volume the author examines the Synoptic Gospels. He finds some direct allusions to the sect of the Scrolls in the New Testament, though he is not of those who read the New Testament into the Scrolls and trace the Church back to the sect of the Scrolls. He is rather able to find both influence of the sect on the beginnings of Christianity and a reaction against the sect. While this ought from the start to have been clear to any who read with care both the New Testament and the Scrolls, it has not seldom been forgotten and needed to be emphasized.

The War Scroll. An excellent and detailed study of the scroll known as the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness has been written by J. Carmignac.[5] It contains the Hebrew text of the Scroll, a translation into French, and a very full

[1] *Rechters—Ruth* [1956]. Romen en Zonen, Roermond en Maaseik.

[2] *Wijsheid* [1957]. Fl. 4.25, or by subscription 3.75.

[3] *Jeremias—Klaagliederen—Baruch—Brief van Jeremias* [1957]. Fl. 19.60, or by subscription 17.60.

[4] *Spätjudisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus*: I. *Das Spätjudentum*; II. *Die Synoptiker* [1957]. Mohr, Tubingen; DM 36.

[5] *La Règle de la Guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres* [1958]. Letouzey et Ané, Paris; Fr. 2,500.

commentary, which takes account of all the literature which has already grown up around this text, and much of the literature on the other Scrolls from Qumran. While there are still many obscurities, and points on which scholars disagree, it is certain that succeeding studies will take account of this valuable work and will gain from it. The Introduction is very brief, and a single page is devoted to the question of the author and the date. Here it is suggested that the War Scroll, the Manual of Discipline and the Hymns come from the hand of a single author, who is none other than the Teacher of Righteousness, and that all were written towards the end of his life *c.* 110 B.C. To the present writer this seems an improbable date, and he finds it hard to suppose that the conditions of that period offer a suitable background for the composition of this text. On this question an important recent article by K. M. T. Atkinson [1] may be consulted. Dr. Carmignac thinks the term *Kittim* does not denote either the Macedonians or the Romans, but foreign foes in general. This again does not seem to the present writer a probable hypothesis, though this is not the place to discuss the question. Disagreement on these broad questions, which are not argued in the work under review, does not lessen appreciation of the careful work on the text which the author has so patiently done.

Romans 9–11. In 1954 Professor Johannes Munck, of Aarhus, published an important study on Paul.[2] He has now published what was intended to be a preliminary study to that work, under the title *Christ and Israel.*[3] This consists of a detailed exegesis of Ro 9–11, preceded by a short introduction. In the introduction he directs attention to the view of T. W. Manson that the Epistle to the Romans was originally addressed both to Rome and to Ephesus, and then considers the situation which formed the background of the Epistle, and the unbelief of the Jews as a problem for the Early Church. The bulk of this book is devoted, however, to the elaborate exegesis of the three chapters of the Epistle and the interpretation of the apostle's thought. At various points in the discussion Professor Munck interposes an excursus, the first dealing with Israel as persecutor, the second—a brief bibliographical excursus—on the concept of the Remnant in both Testaments, and the third on the olive and the wild olive. Of the importance of these three chapters of the Epistle to the Romans every one is aware, and there have been many monographs on them, in addition to the discussions found in the commentaries and the general studies of the thought of Paul. Nevertheless Professor Munck does not simply rehash what is found elsewhere, but brings his own contribution, while taking full account of the work of his predecessors. To summarize a commentary is impossible here in a brief note, and all that can be done is to direct students of the Epistle and of the theology of Paul to this valuable commentary.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester

[1] *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xl. [1957–58], 272 ff., and separately.

[2] *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte.*

[3] *Christus und Israel : eine Auslegung von Röm* 9–11 [1956]. Munksgaard, Copenhagen ; Kr. 11.00.

Entre Nous

Saint Francis Redivivus

It may be true that sometimes the world encounters *Nero Redivivus*, but in the mercy of God it is also true that the world sometimes encounters *Saint Francis Redivivus.*

In 1957 Brother Douglas, Douglas Downes, of the Anglican Society of St. Francis died after a life in which St. Francis did live again ; and now we have his life simply and movingly written in *Brother Douglas : Apostle of the Outcast*, by Father Francis of the Society of Saint Francis (Mowbray ; 7s. 6d. net).

The Headmaster of Eton said of Brother Douglas that ' he had a homing instinct for human misery '. Wherever there was human misery Brother Douglas was there to identify himself with it. He had always this passion for identification with men. When he was a curate in Lambeth he left the house where he was staying to take lodgings in a mean street to be one with his parishioners, and asked that his salary should be halved. When he went to teach in India, he left the staff quarters to live in the students' hostel to be one with those whom he taught.

We meet him in London and in Portsmouth in hostels and homes for soldiers and sailors. We meet him in Egypt in a camp for soldiers with venereal diseases. We meet him in Germany amidst the refugees and the starvation of the immediate post-war world. Always there is this passion for oneness with those in trouble and in

pain. ' Real reform depends on knowledge gained by those who are prepared to suffer in sharing the conditions of those they are trying to help.' Father Algy, who was in many ways different from him, wrote to him : ' You have always stood in the eyes of the world as perhaps the greatest living demonstration of one who, through the corporal works of mercy, expressed sacramentally the charity of God '.

The work for which he will be longest remembered is his work among the tramps on the roads. In the 1920's there were between fifty and sixty thousand tramps on the roads of England. The casual wards, the poorhouses, the doss-houses were dreadful places. Brother Douglas took these men as his parish. He lived with them ; he went out possessing nothing. He shared the horrors of the casual wards and the poorhouses. He said to a novice who wished to join the Order : ' Of course, if you join us, you may end in the workhouse ; but there is a lot of work to do for God there '. He did more than that. He was instrumental in forcing Government action to have such places humanized and civilized. He did even more than that. All over England—almost in every county—there grew up under his inspiration and leadership houses and communities where the tramps could come, sometimes only for a meal, sometimes for the night, sometimes to stay three months, six months, a year, to be prepared to face and undertake life again.

Few men have loved men as he loved them. Once he and his friars were challenged to a discussion by a group of bitter and communistic and atheistic young Welsh miners who hated the Church. To the surprise of the miners Brother Douglas seized the opportunity. One of the miners demanded : ' Can you see God ? ' and Brother Douglas answered : ' Yes. I can see Him now in your eyes '.

Such was his identification with the down-and-outs that, when he was preaching in St. Paul's Cathedral, the only place in London where he would consent to lodge was in the crypt of St. Martin-in-the-Fields.

There was a glorious irresponsibility about him, and a sunny humour. Once he wanted to park the car which the Order possessed, but the brakes were uncertain. ' We're on a bit of a slope ', he said, ' but I have just had this holy book given to me, so let's put it under the wheel to act as a brake.' His life in the casual wards and the like sometimes meant that he, too, collected the inevitable vermin to be found there, and some one tells of him, standing in the aisle of the church, thoughtfully scratching himself, and announcing : ' Now. Count your blessings, name them one by one.' When he was in charge of the hostel set up in the old Westminster Hospital he kept hens on the roof. One of the hens took ill ; Brother Douglas had heard of M. and B. ' He went to a chemist and asked for the drug to cure a young lady who was ill, and there are those who allege that he described her as his sister ! ' St. Francis himself might have done that.

When he was working in Hamburg amidst the refugees after the War, some one said of him : ' He was undoubtingly English—I dare say one hundred per cent English !—and yet his identification with his work, and the poor lamed Germans that he had to deal with was so wonderfully Christian that he seemed to have become there one hundred per cent the man-without-a-nationality, the man-representing-Jesus '.

This is a wonderful story, told with utter sincerity and with the simplicity that is above art. We are grateful that, if only in print, we have met Brother Douglas.

On p. 13 *Ramsey* should be *Ramsay* ; and on p. 47 we think *Anol* should be *Arrol*.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

1959–60

A special feature in the October number is an authoritative list of *Commentaries on the Old Testament*, prepared by six outstanding Old Testament scholars—Professor G. R. Driver, Professor A. R. Johnson, Professor John Mauchline, Professor H. H. Rowley, Principal N. H. Snaith and Professor D. Winton Thomas.

In the same month, and in November, the two parts of Professor Cullmann's very important article—*Approach to the Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*—will be given in an English translation.

Among other articles coming soon are ' Biblical Criticism and Theological Integrity ', ' The Impact of American Religion on Great Britain ', ' The Doctrine of Creation in the Light of Modern Astronomy ' and ' The Lord's Prayer in Modern Research '. This last article is by Professor Jeremias.

During the year there will be at least three series. Beginning in December Dr. Barclay will discuss the *Hellenistic Background of the New Testament*. Concurrently there will be a series on *Modern Issues in Biblical Studies*, to be followed by one on *Significant Modern Writers*.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.